The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXVIII, No. 4 APRIL, 1948

CONTENTS

The Pastor and Non-Catholics . *James J. Navaugh* 241

On Some Rights of Words . *Msgr. John K. Ryan* 248

The Hospital Chaplain and the Administration of Baptism and Penance . *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 254

Bellarmine's Defence of Canonized Saints *John A. Hardon, S.J.* 265

The Ordeal of Father Wall. Part III *Thomas Owen Martin* 274

New Dioceses of China . *Francis J. Winslow, M.M.* 286

The Theological Proof for the Necessity of the Catholic Church. Part II . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 290

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Association with Divorced Persons 306

A Moral Problem for Embalmers 309

Cloth of Gold *versus* "Old Gold" 310

Contents Continued on Next Page

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price, currency: United States and Canada, $4.50; Foreign, $5.00. 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1948, by The Catholic University of America Press

Contents Continued from Previous Page

Absolution at the Grave 311

Correct Ringing of the *Angelus* 311

Only One Processional Cross 312

The *Alleluia Extra Tempus Paschale* 312

Bless-ed *versus* Blest Again 313

BOOK REVIEWS

Il nazionalsocialismo e la santa sede
By Michele Maccarrone 314

The Messias . . . . . *By Josef Pickl* 316

The Three Ages of the Interior Life. Vol. I
By Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange 317

God's Own Method . . . *By Aloysius McDonough* 319

Mary of Nazareth . . . . *By Igino Giordani* 320

A Friendly Easter Thought For Priests

Have you ever thought of an "Apostolate to the Priesthood"?

1. *Missionary Priests*

The American Ecclesiastical Review receives many requests from priests in poor and missionary sections of this country and abroad for free subscriptions. Unfortunately, we are not in a position to honor these requests. You, however, can do a good work by sending us your check to be applied to one or more of these requests. U.S.A., Canada, and Pan-America. $4.50; foreign, $5.00 per year.

2. *Seminarians*

What better way to start a Seminarian on the path of priestly interests and reading than a subscription to *The American Ecclesiastical Review*. We offer the special subscription rate of $3.50 per year on Seminarian subscriptions. If you know of a boy studying for the priesthood, why not subscribe for him? The gift would be appreciated.

Write Today:

THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA
WASHINGTON 17, D. C.

THE PASTOR AND NON-CATHOLICS

It is the function of the Catholic Church to preach the Gospel to every creature. This missionary activity of the Church is divided in Canon 1350 into two fields. In the organized areas of the world, and therefore in the United States, the fundamental mission is passed on to the local Ordinary and to the pastors. In the mission fields, the Holy See itself directs the activities. The zealous pastor will realize that his mission to the non-Catholics of his parish is the same as that of the missionary who goes to China or Africa. The non-Catholics are committed to his care, just as those of China are committed to the care of the Chinese missionaries.

The obligation, according to canonists, is a very grave one, because it is one of the fundamental duties of the Catholic Church, of the Catholic hierarchy and the Catholic clergy. According to Coronata, "Hoc esse gravissimum Ordinariorum locorum et etiam parochorum officium ex jure divino constat" (par. 933). Pope Leo XIII in his letter *Longinqua oceani* to the American clergy stresses the *Missio Apostolica* of every member of the clergy. Yet it is interesting, glancing through the books of moral theology to note how many authors omit mention of this Canon and how others content themselves with the reproduction of the bare Canon.

In addition to the above, it is clear that there does exist an obligation from charity, and that obligation a grave one, for the parochial clergy to make an effort to present the doctrine of the Church to all who live within the limits of the parish. This obligation would seem to rest especially on these three facts: (1) that Christ and the Church intend the evangelization of all men; (2) the Catholic Church and the means which she, alone, offers for salvation are really necessary for every human being; (3) that since the ordinary non-Catholic does not investigate the Church and her teachings of his own accord, it is necessary to bring them to his attention.

It is interesting to analyze the reasons behind our current attitude towards our non-Catholic population. The attitude seems to be based, in most cases, on one or more of the following reasons: (1) a curious and un-Catholic acceptance of the *status quo;* (2) fear of awakening antagonism on the part of our non-

Catholic neighbors; (3) a rather smug realization that Protestantism, because of its abandonment of doctrine, is crumbling; (4) only slight response or entire lack of response on the part of non-Catholics to efforts previously made; (5) a willingness to act but ignorance of just what to do.

Let us one by one study these attitudes, discover the reasons behind them and suggest some remedies:

(1) *Acceptance of the* status quo. This attitude is based on an abuse of the good Catholic doctrine that Faith is a free gift of God. It is erroneously thought that non-Catholics must wait patiently until God in His goodness gives them the gift of Faith and there's nothing which we can do except, perhaps, to say some prayers to aid them. As for the gift of Faith, it is true that it is a free gift. We do not deserve it. We cannot merit it. What it is necessary to realize is this: that the priest is the instrument by which God intends to bring the Faith to others and as an efficient instrument it is his duty to arouse in outsiders a consciousness of their need and then to unite with them in asking God to give them this greatest of free gifts.

(2) *The fear of arousing antagonism on the part of non-Catholics.* By our Lord's prophecy, this antagonism almost universally accompanies the preaching of His doctrine, but apart from this, the fear some of us possess would seem to be greatly exaggerated. It does not follow at all that a proper, aggressive presentation of Catholic doctrine arouses any overwhelming antagonism providing, of course, care is taken to avoid *personal* offense. It would seem that nowadays we overrate the influence of doctrinal bigots. Unlike a priest, the average non-Catholic minister extends his influence over a relatively small group of people. The vast majority of non-Catholics, while deeply ignorant of Catholic doctrine and prejudiced because of their background, sincerely want to be fair and they can be applied to *over the heads of their leaders.* Finally, we must not overlook the present widespread curiosity about things Catholic and the deep inner appeal of Catholic doctrine to all men once it is properly understood.

(3) *The smug realization that organized Protestantism is crumbling.* Unfortunately, this realization does not take into account the fact that the former Protestants are not flowing into the Catholic Church in any great numbers. The ignorant among them are evidencing an unholy affection for the "lunatic fringe"

religions. Communism is picking up many and the vast majority are lapsing into a paganism blacker than that which held men when the Apostles began to preach. This realization ought to arouse in us the will to make frantic efforts to claim these people for our own.

(4) *Only slight response, or an entire lack of response on the part of non-Catholics to efforts made to interest them in the Catholic Church with the result that all efforts ceased.* Confronted with this situation we must realize: (a) that experience teaches that because there are no *visible* results, it by no means follows that there are no results to our efforts; (b) that the evils of the Reformation and four hundred years of hostile propaganda cannot be undone in one year or two or five or ten; and (c) that since it is God's will that this work be done, it ought to be done just as well as possible, without the slightest regard for visible results. As Cardinal Newman puts it: "To expect great effects from our exertions for religious objects is natural, indeed, and innocent, but it arises from inexperience of what kind of work we have to do—to change the heart and the will of men"; (d) experience teaches too, that results are cumulative. They increase only with the years and the results of efforts made today may not appear for many years. What we need is a mighty act of Faith in the power of the Gospel, well taught, to change the hearts and minds of men. What we need is a realization that ours is a Ministry not only to Catholics but to all men; what we need is the activity which will follow uch realization.

(5) *Willingness to act but ignorance of just what to do.* Here, of course, the problem is the presentation of Catholic truth to non-Catholics. Broadly, what is needed is the preaching of the Gospel to everybody within the confines of the parish. The practical problem of how to reach and arouse interest in each person has not been solved completely. It is for the pastor to examine his local situation, plan, look into the efforts of others and then strike out boldly, trusting that God will bring about the results H wants from halting, feeble, inefficient human efforts.

As pointed out above, the burden of extending the Church is on the pastors of parishes. And in truth, if we are to reach into every nook and corner of our country it is only by the means of the parish organization that we can do it. It will be parochial effort which will bring about the conversion of America.

What specifically should we do in order to fulfill our obligations towards the non-Catholics about us? What we want is a method, effective and dignified, in keeping with the nature of the Church. It should be evident that, while the priest has duties himself, the laity must unite under his direction so that the parish itself becomes apostolic in every respect. By every sermon he preaches and especially by his example the pastor must make his people realize that the Catholic Church is conscious of her mission to every soul. His people must realize, as Pope Leo XIII points out in *Longinqua*, that their fidelity to God's law is important not only for themselves but for its effect upon others. The priest must continually point out concrete efforts which the people can make, and the announcements on Sunday, as well as the sermon, must drive home the realization that the Church is anxious to bring into Her fold every non-Catholic in the neighborhood.

In working for the conversion of our fellow Americans two elements enter in. First, the preparing of large numbers for accepting the Catholic Faith and, secondly, the instruction and reception of those who have developed a deep interest in the Church.

Sometime ago, in trying to discover what attracts non-Catholics to the Church, the writer had a number of converts to the Church answer the question "What first aroused your interest in the Catholic Church?" The answers grouped themselves under three headings: (1) I was deeply impressed by a Catholic priest or by a Catholic layman; (2) I was attracted by a piece of Catholic literature; (3) I was deeply moved by a Catholic service I attended. Perhaps these answers will give us some clue as to what we ought to do.

It was surprising to discover how, in most cases, interest in the Church is awakened by a member of the Church, either a priest or a layman. This seems to be the source of the most interest. As one man put it, "Your best advertisements are your priests." Now most of these people met Catholic priests almost by chance. If we are to interest vast numbers in the Church we must have a system and the easiest way to introduce numbers of non-Catholics to the priesthood is for the priest to start a systematic visit to every non-Catholic home in his parish. The question immediately arises, "Will he be welcome?" The writer's experience and that of the priests who have worked with him is an unqualified "Yes." It is surprising the vast numbers of people who

are interested in meeting a Catholic priest and who willingly receive him; who are, in fact, flattered by the fact that he visits them. Ordinarily speaking, it is not an impossible task to visit all the homes in a town or a parish. If the average priest spends about fifteen minutes in each home, more or less, and making an average of about twenty visits a week, can easily see around one thousand families a year. A brief little talk to get acquainted, an expression of willingness to be of service, a few compliments passed, a friendly invitation to Mass, a little pamphlet explaining the Catholic religion left in the home, will be the beginning of the conversion of the family. If Sisters who will do parish visiting can be found, so much the better. If a Catholic action group can be organized with the idea of visiting, fine, but it can be set down as a fundamental principle that only by such visiting can the ground work be laid for the conversions of the non-Catholics in our parishes.

This visitation must be systematic. Every house on every street and road should be visited successively. A record should be made of each visit. Just as we have census cards for those who profess the Catholic Faith so we should have census cards for the non-Catholics. It should be noted, however, that these cards should not be filled out in the presence of the family but made out later from memory. Special note should be made of those who show interest in the Church and a return visit should be paid them after not too long an interval. And once one complete round of the parish has been made another should be started for new families will have moved in and awakened interest will be found in those who have been previously visited.

The second and important necessity in evangelizing our non-Catholic neighbors is the regular distribution to each of them of Catholic literature. This distribution is a useful preparation for the visit of the priest. It emphasizes the importance Catholics put on their religion. It shows the interest of the Catholic in his non-Catholic neighbors. It enlightens the non-Catholic on Catholic doctrine.

The distribution should be regular, at least monthly. It should reach every family in the parish. Preferably it should be in a news form, ever pro-Catholic in tone but not offensive or anti-Protestant. It should clearly point out the errors of Protestantism but in a friendly way. In city parishes it can be distributed from door

to door by the altar boys. In the country it can be sent through the mail. In addition, as the priest makes his rounds, he will gradually compile his list of people who show an interest in the Church. To these should go, each month, some Catholic pamphlet. This will keep alive and deepen interest in the Church.

The question may arise "Will they read it?" After six years of experimenting the writer can say, with certainty, "Yes." Some, of course, will discard it but most will read with keen interest. Again it may be asked, "Will the broadcasting of Catholic literature in this fashion be resented?" By some few, of course, it will be deeply resented; but in most cases the answer is "No." Rather it will be received and appreciated. It might be asked too, "What about the expense?" The expense, relatively speaking, is slight and can be easily borne by any parish. What we must keep before our minds is that the parish is actually not the physical structure, such as the church, the school and the rectory, but the parish is the people, and, as we willingly spend to maintain and augment our buildings, we should be more willing to spend to maintain and extend the real parish which is the souls under our care.

As a third necessity for evangelizing the non-Catholics who surround us, we must make it clear that they are welcome within the walls of the Catholic Church. To do this we must extend to them an invitation to come and then we must make them welcome when they do come. What practically can we do? The priest himself can invite the non-Catholics he meets to Mass. He can impress upon his people the need to spread the idea among their non-Catholic friends that they are welcome in the Catholic Church, and, more than that, he can urge them to bring these friends with them to Sunday Mass or to other services. The writer has found it useful to have in the local newspaper a paid insertion each week, telling a little about the Church and then inviting outsiders to come. Ushers should be instructed to watch out for strangers and to greet them with a smile of welcome and to show them to their seats. Parishioners should realize their duty to greet the strangers they meet at Mass as fellow members, either real or potential, of the Mystical Body of Christ. Finally, the priest at the door of the church at the end of Mass, greeting cordially all who have been present, will produce a profound effect and will make outsiders realize that they have indeed been within the doors of their Father's house.

The activities above outlined will create an increasing interest in the Church. The problem will then arise on how to capitalize on this interest by actually bringing these people into the Church. The instruction class seems to be the most effective way unless it appears in specific cases that private instruction is necessary and desirable. The instruction class should run continuously in a cycle course so that anyone may enter at any time. Many articles have been written on methods of conducting these classes and all that is to be emphasized is this: if they are to be most successful the whole parish must be united behind them. People should be told practically how to help. They should be reminded continually at Sunday Mass to : (1) select a non-Catholic whom they think will make a good Catholic; (2) pray fervently for him; (3) bring him to the instruction class.

It can be asked what the results of all these efforts will be. After seven years of experimenting the writer can state, with certainty, that this will follow: (1) there will be an end of most bigotry and misunderstanding; (2) the young non-Catholics will show great interest in the Church; (3) beginning with a few, an increasing number of non-Catholics will take instructions; (4) Catholics will take an ever-increasing pride in the Church; the danger of defection will be practically ended and a very large number of fallen-away Catholics will begin again to practice their religion; (5) the prestige of the Catholic Church among non-Catholics will increase by leaps and bounds for it is the spirit of the American to admire courage and aggressiveness; (6) if the testimony of Catholics and many non-Catholics may be accepted it will lay the foundation of a return of vast numbers of non-Catholics to the one Fold and the one Shepherd.

JAMES J. NAVAUGH

Missionary Apostolate
Mayville, N. Y.

MISSION INTENTION

"That the social order in China be preserved from atheistic communism" is the Mission Intention for the month of April, 1948.

ON SOME RIGHTS OF WORDS

Words, said Ernest Hello, are terrible in their complaisance. They are passive, helpless, and submissive to any indignity. It is entirely possible for a speaker or writer to take a word—God, soul, mind, idea, religion, good, evil, democracy, liberty, or any other—and attach to it his own personal definition. By good I mean pleasure, says one man; by good I mean any object of desire, says another; by good I mean duty, says a third.

In many instances, with such definitions as purely personal statements of use and meaning no issue can be taken. They are neither good nor bad, neither true nor false, neither correct nor incorrect. They simply are, that is, they are simple statements of fact. But it must be remembered that the fact that they state is merely what the speaker means by a word; it is not the fact of what the thing it names may really be.

The extreme form of such personal verbalism in definition is that expressed by Humpty Dumpty:

"I don't know what you mean by 'glory,'" Alice said.

Humpty Dumpty smiled contemptuously. "Of course you don't—till I tell you. I meant, 'there's a nice knock-down argument for you!'"

"But 'glory' doesn't mean 'a nice knock-down argument,'" Alice objected.

"When *I* use a word," Humpty Dumpty said, in rather a scornful tone, "it means just what I choose it to mean—neither more nor less."

"The question is," said Alice, "whether you *can* make words mean so many different things."

"The question is," said Humpty Dumpty, "which is to be master—that's all."

Ordinarily we neither can be nor wish to be master in so complete a fashion as that of Humpty Dumpty. It is a task beyond our powers to construct a personal language in which old terms are given entirely new and arbitrary definitions. However, there are countless cases where we have to define our terms. We are called upon to state clearly and explicitly what is our understanding of the matter at hand and in what sense we are using our terms for it. Moreover, such needs and demands arise most frequently and most insistently when our concern is with things of the highest importance and of the greatest depth and difficulty.

Inevitably, vast differences, and even complete contradictions, appear among the various definitions advanced when explicit statements of meaning are demanded. Coleridge's story of the two theologians discussing what they meant by the word God is an instance of this. "I see now," said one of them, "your God is my devil." So also we meet men and women whose definitions of freedom, democracy, religion, tolerance, law, morality, and countless other terms are so little like our own as to be barely comprehensible to us.

Likewise illustrative of this, although not extremely so, is the opening of Plato's *Philebus*, in which Socrates states what he and Philebus mean by the word good.

> Philebus was saying that enjoyment and pleasure and delight, and the class of feelings akin to them, are a good to every living being, whereas I contend that not these, but wisdom and intelligence and memory, and their kindred, right opinion and true reasoning, are better and more desirable than pleasure for all who are able to partake of them, and that to all such who are or ever will be they are the most advantageous of all things. Have I not given, Philebus, a fair statement of the two sides of the argument?[1]

Differences of definition may also be illustrated by the term substance. For the scholastic philosopher substance was "that which exists in itself and not in something else as in a subject." Thus a man is a substance: he exists "in himself," although at the same time he may well exist within a house. René Descartes ordered the matter somewhat differently. For him substance was a thing "which so exists that it needs no other thing for its existence." According to such a definition, only God is a substance, for only God is truly independent in His existence, a conclusion that was not welcome to Descartes. Spinoza too had his definition: "By substance, I understand that which is in itself and is conceived through itself; in other words, that the conception of which does not need the conception of another thing from which it needs to be formed." The scholastic, Descartes, and Spinoza, each of them has his own statement of what he means by the term substance.

There is an important difference between the position of the

[1] Raphael Demos, editor, *The Dialogues of Plato*. Translated by Benjamin Jowett (New York: Random House, 1937), I, 343.

scholastic and that of Descartes and Spinoza in stating what he means by the word substance. For the scholastic states not only what he means by the word but also what the community of thinkers to which he belongs means by it. His is a statement of public and communal meaning rather than of personal and private meaning. Ordinarily, if he is known to be a representative scholastic thinker, he is not even required to state his definition. But the innovator of meanings is in a different case. Upon him there is a greater obligation to give formal definition of his terms with candor and exactness than there is upon one who follows the thought as well as the tongue of his society.

For the thinker who attaches new meanings to old terms, as for every man who uses his words in a manner that is open to objection or challenge, this obligation to clarify his speech is both artistic and moral. It is a necessary part of all genuine reasoning and of all intelligible discourse that the meaning of terms be fixed and known. It is a requirement of all thought and of its proper expression that a term be used univocally, that is, in the same sense, throughout a given context. A shifting, changing, ambiguous, and equivocal use of words has no place in the work of the honest artisan. If a thinker finds that he cannot define his terms, he must recognize his incompetence to speak and write. If he is loathe to state clearly what he means by any debatable term, then he is not honest with his hearers and he has lost his right to speak to them.

There is a further aspect, again both moral and artistic, to this matter. Words are for the most part public, not private property. There is something of forgery and theft in Humpty Dumpty's mastery over the word glory. There is an invasion of the rights of others when words of established public meanings are seized upon and put to new personal and private uses. Most of all is an injustice done when the term was originally formed and used precisely to convey the traditional and accepted meaning. To fashion needed terms and to formulate exact definitions is one of the most important and difficult of tasks. Part of Aristotle's greatness as a thinker is found in his care in the formation of a vocabulary to express his thought. Hence there is a sort of thievery as well as a species of sloth in the misappropriation of words that are the fruits of other men's labors.

It is as well a sin against art that is committed when accepted

terms are tortured into conveying new personal meanings. If new realities have been discovered, they deserve the honor of new names. If things once thought to be real are now found to be nonexistent, the words that name them should not be transferred to real objects. We know that satyrs and centaurs do not exist, but we do not feel free to use these terms for some new-found tribes of brutes or men. Yet many words of far greater dignity and value are subjected to the most wanton abuse.

In the introduction to his *Philosophy of History* Hegel writes that "The insight to which philosophy is to lead us is that the real world is as it ought to be—that the truly good—the universal reason—is not a mere abstraction, but a vital principle capable of realizing itself. This *Good*, this *Reason*, in its most concrete form is God."[2] A better procedure, in philosophy as well as in art, would have led Hegel to write something like this: "I hold that there is no infinite, eternal, all-good, and all-powerful being, such as men once meant when they used the term God, and such as the general run of men still mean. I hold that all that is real is one eternal and unending process or activity. God does not exist apart from this world-process. At best, we can say that He is coming into existence: He is being created, rather than a creative being. Since this is what I really hold, I will stop being ambiguous and equivocal in my use of the term God. Until I can fashion a better term to name my great discovery, I will call this process by the neutral term 'X.'"

In similar fashion, both the writer who holds that God is "the struggle and mysterious pain at the heart of the universe," and the pragmatist who defined God as "the sum of ideals" can strive to express themselves more fully and accurately. In time they can devise words that will suit their thoughts and findings. They will thus enrich human speech and yet leave the old term God untouched. It would still name "the king of ages, immortal and invisible," whom they seemingly think to be nonexistent along with the gods and demigods and nymphs and satyrs of ancient days. For in these personal definitions a truth-claim is usually, if not always, advanced. Rarely are thinkers concerned merely with words as such, and rarely are they content to put forth merely verbal definitions. The man who says, "By the term God

[2] G. W. F. Hegel, *The Philosophy of History*. Translated by J. Sibree (New York: The Colonial Press, 1900), p. 36.

I mean—" not only states how he uses the word but as well makes the claim that here at length is the real truth of this matter set forth in succinct and final form.

Yet there has been singularly little enrichment of language by those who are freest with their personal definitions. To add to speech a needed word is to make a contribution to one's fellow men and to win from them some measure of gratitude and remembrance. Aside from such an incentive, it would seem that the thinker who can so readily produce new thoughts should as well produce new words. When this does not hold, it may be suspected that the wanton use of old and honored terms is an evidence of an actual poverty of thought. Where there is genuinely creative thought, followed by new discoveries and new productions, a suitable vocabulary is forthcoming. An illustration is found in the case of the physical sciences in our own time. Thoughts, words, and things go together. An enlargement of men's minds is followed by an enlargement of their speech, and a genuine originality of thought will be manifested in a new and fresh growth of words.

There is something that may be called the converse of this duty of discovering new words for new conceptions and of not abusing traditional terms by the imposition of arbitrary meanings. It is the duty that rests on the traditionalist and conservative of speaking and writing in a fresh and effective way. The orthodox theologian and the authoritative representative of the *philosophia perennis* have a right to the vocabulary that was fashioned for them by so many thinkers and writers at the cost of so much labor. They above others have a duty of respecting the lexicon handed down to them by their intellectual forebears. But they must make these terms live as parts of a living speech, intelligible to the men and women of a new generation and with an appeal to them.

Doctrines that express the real nature of men and of things and that state their true causes do not change with the passage of centuries. They are analogous to the elementary human passions and emotions. These last are the stuff out of which all great art is made. The artists of succeeding ages and of different lands are great only in so far as they can give a new and authentic expression to what is deepest in human nature. So it is with the philosophers and theologians. They too attain greatness only

when they give a comprehensive and persuasive statement to the deepest truths. This may be seen in the work of the very greatest thinkers, in Plato and Aristotle, in Augustine and Aquinas. It is seen as well in men who are less than these but nevertheless great in what they have striven for and in part achieved. Plotinus, Boethius, Pascal, Newman, and Bergson will serve as examples. Like the very greatest, these men are artists as well as thinkers. Their superiority lies partly in the fact that they belonged to their generation even while transcending it. They saw that it was no small part of their task to speak in the language of their time and place. They saw too that it was their task to put this language to new uses and to raise it to higher levels. In the response that the great thinkers have evoked, both in their own day and ever since, is convincing proof of their wisdom as thinkers and of their power as artists. Their success is a challenge to all of us who adhere to the great tradition. It is likewise a portent of what will come once again when there arise among the people men who are masters of both thought and word.

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

PRAYER AND HOLINESS

All the saints lived in an atmosphere of prayer, and, if we are to walk in their footsteps, we must breathe the same atmosphere. In the history of God's Church, we meet with saints of all nations, of all ages, and of every condition of life; kings and queens, popes and cardinals, courtiers and chancellors, soldiers and servants, laborers and even beggars, learned and ignorant, old and young, the robust in health and confirmed invalids. In short, there is no walk in life in which canonized saints, celebrated for their heroic virtues and workers of miracles, are not to be found.

But, differ as much as they may in every other respect, in one respect they were all alike. They were without exception men of prayer. Although poles apart in other things, one great characteristic dominated them all. They one and all made prayer the chief and foremost duty of their lives.

—Bishop John S. Vaughan, in *The Minister of Christ* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, Inc., 1926), I, 66 ff.

THE HOSPITAL CHAPLAIN AND THE ADMINISTRATION OF BAPTISM AND PENANCE

The priest who exercises the office of chaplain in a hospital, whether he resides in the institution or fulfills this duty as one phase of his parochial activities, is charged with a most important and most difficult form of the priestly ministry. This is particularly true if the hospital is non-sectarian or is conducted under the auspices of a non-Catholic denomination. Even the chaplain in a Catholic h spital frequently encounters grave difficulties—for example, when he is called on to reconcile dying persons who have lived for many years away from God, or to solve complicated moral problems in connection with proposed medical or surgical treatment, or to investigate the marital entanglements of patients whom sickness has finally induced to submit their cases to the judgment of the Church. But, in addition to these, the priest who attends the patients in a non-Catholic hospital is often presented with special problems which call for a great measure of wisdom, prudence, and zeal. He may have to face bitter hostility, either veiled or open, to the exercise of his ministry; he may have to administer the sacraments in circumstances that are entirely unsuited to these holy rites; he may have to give decisions regarding what is permitted and what is forbidden in the matter of co-operation in operations which the Catholic Church forbids as opposed to the law of God. Our standard works of moral and pastoral theology give little attention to the difficulties of a chaplain in such a situation. They seem to suppose that the sick and dying are in their homes or in Catholic institutions; whereas the fact is that hospitalization is a common feature of modern life in America, and a great number of Catholics are patients in hospitals that are not under Catholic management.

Accordingly, it has been decided to discuss in a series of articles in the pages of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* some topics relating to the work of the hospital chaplain, particularly the chaplain attached to a non-Catholic hospital. Naturally, no attempt will be made to compress into a few articles all the particular problems that a chaplain might encounter; but it is hoped that these articles will touch on all the more common and more puzzling problems, and while attempting a solution will also

propose general principles that will help toward the clarification of other difficulties. The present article will begin the treatment of matters affecting the ministry of the chaplain himself, especially the administration of the sacraments; subsequently, it is hoped, attention will be given to the problems that may be presented to the chaplain by patients or by the personnel of the hospital.

It requires no profundity of intelligence to realize that the hospital chaplain must take every reasonable care not to give offence, thus drawing down on himself or on the priesthood in general the antagonism of those persons with whom he comes in contact. He must be courteous and kindly toward all, even toward those who may not act in the same manner toward him. He must endeavor to adapt his visiting hours to the convenience of the nurses and doctors, even though it may involve some inconvenience to himself. When visiting a patient in a ward, he must be careful not to disturb others by loud talk and boisterous laughter. Of course, there are times when he must stand on his rights, particularly when one of the Catholic patients needs him, and some of the doctors or nurses object—usually on the score that the sick person will be frightened by the visit of the clergyman. They may be inclined to let their patients slip out of life without realizing the end is at hand. The priest cannot compromise with such an attitude and, when he knows that a Catholic is in danger of death, he should demand to be admitted. A difficult situation arises when the patient himself is so obstinate in his refusal to receive the sacraments that he gives orders that the priest shall be kept out. Faced with such a situation in a non-Catholic hospital, the chaplain can do little but acquiesce and pray that the sick person will have a change of heart—even though he is aware that the law of God gives him a right to admittance, whatever may be the wishes of the dying sinner. If the priest were to create a scene in such circumstances and insist on being admitted, or if he should attempt by stealth to get into the sick-room, the consequence might be restrictions and denunciations that would far outweigh the good he might possibly effect.

In the administration of the sacraments in a non-Catholic hospital, especially in a public ward, the priest must be on his guard lest by too much ceremonial he excite undue curiosity in unbelievers which may develop into ridicule. The Church itself

takes cognizance of this factor when it rules that the Blessed Sacrament may be carried to the sick privately for a just and reasonable cause.[1] On the other hand, the chaplain should remember that too great reticence in the matter of Catholic belief and worship, as if our reverence for the sacraments were something to be ashamed of, is a deplorable trait in any Catholic, especially in a priest. It is not easy to lay down general rules in this matter, for circumstances may vary considerably in different hospitals. By inquiry I have found out that in some non-Catholic hospitals the priest in distributing Holy Communion wears his street garb with a stole under the coat and administers the Holy Eucharist at the bedside, even without any candles. In other hospitals, even in the presence of a considerable number of non-Catholic patients, the chaplain is accustomed to enter the ward in cassock and surplice and to give Holy Communion with all the prescribed ceremonies; and this rite excites no unfavorable comment or ridicule, but on the contrary is viewed reverently by the non-Catholics. Both methods could be defended in view of the particular conditions prevailing in each place. But the point to be emphasized is this: there must be a good, objective reason in order that a priest may be justified in omitting or abbreviating the ceremonies prescribed by the ritual, particularly the lighted candles. It is true, this latter ceremonial prescription binds only *sub veniali*,[2] yet the Church is evidently very anxious to have it observed. The chaplain must not allow himself to diminish the due ceremonies merely because he can thus make things easier or more expeditious for himself.

The administration of baptism in a hospital may be required either for an adult or for an infant. When the adult himself has explicitly asked for this sacrament, the priest's task is comparatively easy. He gives the sick person the necessary instruction, proportionate in content and in length of time to his intellectual capacities, the proximity of death, etc., and confers the sacrament of regeneration. In the case of one who had been a member of an heretical or a schismatic sect, and is now being reconciled (and perhaps being baptized conditionally, as is usually done for one who received this sacrament from an heretical

[1] Can. 847.

[2] St. Alphonsus, *Theologia moralis* (ed. Gaudé, Rome, 1909), Lib. VI, n. 241.

minister), a solemn profession of faith is supposed to be made containing the abjuration of his former errors.[3] A short form of such a profession, available for cases of grave and urgent necessity, is found in the small rituals generally used by priests in this country; and this would suffice, not only in the event that the convert is very weak or in proximate danger of death but also when it might be embarrassing for him to recite the longer form in a ward where he would be overheard.

If there is urgent need of haste on account of the proximity of death, the doctrinal instruction of one wishing to receive baptism can be limited to the four fundamental truths, namely, the existence of God, the reward and punishment due to the soul in the future life, the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. At times the priest may have reason to doubt if the sick person has sufficiently grasped these truths (especially the third and fourth), but realizes that there is immediate need of baptism. In that event, he should confer the sacrament; *but not conditionally with reference to the sufficiency of the person's explicit faith.* In other words, the sacrament should be given *absolutely*, even though there is reason to doubt whether or not the dying man's faith is sufficiently explicit to obtain the fruit of baptism, as long as he certainly desires the sacrament.[4]

However, baptism is to be given conditionally if there is some doubt as to the recipient's intention to receive this means of salvation. This is particularly the case when a non-Catholic patient is dying unconscious and it is known that he professed belief in God, even though it was very vague, and apparently had very little influence on his life and conduct. It seems to be a sufficiently probable opinion that baptism can be given in such circumstances on the principle that the dying person may have had a general intention of serving God which included the desire of the means necessary to salvation.[5] In such a case, the sacrament is to be given conditionally on his intention to receive it, and also on the non-validity of any former baptism he may have received. "Si capax es" is a general condition that covers both contigencies.

[3] *Rituale romanum* (Ratisbon, 1926), *Supplementum pro Provinciis Americae Sept. Foed.*, p. 2.

[4] Cf. Connell, "Priestly Ministry of the Essentials of Faith," *The American Ecclesiastical Review*, LXXVI, 6 (June, 1927), 576.

[5] Cf. Wouters, *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Bruges, 1933), p. 33.

A case that offers even greater difficulty is that of the dying person, completely unconscious, of whose religious status nothing whatsoever is known. He may be a Catholic, a Protestant, a Jew, or an unbeliever. What can the chaplain do in such a case? Some theologians believe that it is forbidden to confer baptism on such a person, because the law of the Church prohibits the administration of this sacrament to any adult unless he is "sciens et volens."[6] But there is another opinion, which seems sufficiently probable to be followed safely, according to which the sacrament of regeneration may be administered conditionally even to this poor unfortunate. The best argument seems to be that on the law of averages there is some probability that every unknown individual is an unbaptized person who either explicitly or implicitly desires baptism.[7]

When there is a sufficient justification to confer baptism on an unconscious dying adult, it is also permitted to anoint him, at least conditionally. This should be preceded by conditional absolution, unless it is certain that the person is now receiving the baptismal ceremony for the first time.[8]

The sacrament of baptism should also be given (absolutely) to a child in danger of death, and (conditionally) to one who is probably still living, though death has apparently taken place. When it is the child of Catholic parents, and the priest is expected or asked to perform the ceremony, there is no difficulty. In other cases which may occur especially in a non-Catholic hospital it seems better to have the child baptized by a reliable nurse. The priest should instruct her most carefully in the method of conferring the sacrament, so that there may be full assurance that she pronounces the requisite words exactly and audibly while she is pouring the water on the infant's brow, and also that she has the definite and absolute intention of baptizing the child—not some form of intention conditioned on a future event, such as the intention of baptizing only in the event that the child will die. A record of all children baptized in the hospital should be kept by the chaplain, and (at least in the event that the child survives) a

[6] Can. 752, §1.

[7] Cf. Vermeersch, *Theologia moralis* (Brussels, 1927), III, 243; Cappello *De sacramentis* (Rome, 1938), I, n. 159.

[8] Cf. Kilker, *Extreme Unction* (St. Louis, 1927), pp. 126 ff.

transcription should be sent to the pastor of the parish in which the child's parents reside.

The baptism of every fetus that is at least probably alive should also be the concern of the hospital chaplain. In the non-Catholic hospital it is likely that "therapeutic" abortions will be performed with greater or less frequency, so that the opportunity of baptizing little ones in this immature stage will be fairly common. Since it would ordinarily be incongruous for a priest to be present in the operating room, the service of a nurse who will be available on the occasion of such operations should be sought. Indeed, one of the reasons which can be adduced in favor of permitting a Catholic nurse to render material co-operation toward such operations is the opportunity it affords of baptizing these children, whose death is brought about by the materialistic methods of present-day medicine and surgery.

Even for the baptism of adults who have not asked explicitly for the priest—the non-Catholics and the unknown individuals spoken of above—prudence sometimes dictates that in a non-Catholic hospital the services of a nurse be utilized by the priest. Furthermore, when a baptism would stir up great hostility against the Church, the principle that the common good must be preferred to the good of the individual should be applied. Thus, it is a lesser evil that an individual child should die without this saving sacrament than that the ministry of the priest be hedged about with restriction and supervision, or perhaps that Catholic nurses be excluded from the hospital personnel.

When the priest baptizes a child or adult in danger of death, the ceremonies which follow the actual administration of the sacrament should be conferred—namely, the anointing of the head with chrism, the giving of the white cloth and of the candle.[9] Needless to say, if there is a good reason for omitting even these ceremonies the chaplain may do so, and content himself with the merely essential factors of the sacrament. Similarly, he need not be too anxious to provide a godparent, since in private baptism a godparent is called for only if one can be easily obtained; and in any event the obligation is only a light one.[10] The priest who confers baptism privately should use the consecrated water, if

[9] Can. 759, §1.

[10] Can. 762; cf. Cappello, *op. cit.*, I, n. 118.

he can procure it, but one below the rank of deacon uses ordinary water, or preferably clean Holy Water.[11]

Sometimes the priest is invited to say some prayers with a person who is not a Catholic, when circumstances do not seem to warrant an attempt to point out the truth of the Catholic religion—perhaps because the patient is quite debilitated and evidently in no condition for lengthy and connected reasoning, or because he is so definitely set in his own religious views that an argument, however logical, would plainly be ineffective. In such a case it would be permissible for the priest to recite with the sick person prayers which would include the fundamental truths of faith and the theological virtues, especially contrition based on charity. A very excellent formula of such prayers, which can be recommended to all hospital chaplains and nurses, has been published by Msgr. Markham of Cincinnati.

In the administration of the sacrament of Penance in a public ward the chaplain should remember and not hesitate to apply the principle laid down by theologians, that the danger of forfeiting one's reputation, which would ordinary be present if a person's confession of serious sins (especially those *contra sextum*)was overheard by another person besides the priest, is a sufficient reason for excusing the patient from the material integrity of confession.[12] Consequently, the patient in a public ward where the beds are close together and others might hear the conversation between the priest and the patient can be told that he fully satisfies his obligation of confessing his sins for the time being if he merely makes a general acknowledgment that he has sinned and wishes to have his sins forgiven by the priest. It is far better for the priest to make use of this principle than to adopt extraordinary measures to secure secrecy—for example, to put his ear practically into the penitent's mouth, or (as I have heard related of one priest in a hospital) to cover his head and that of the penitent with the bedclothing! Of course, when the priest judges that the penitent is excused in the particular circumstances from the obligation of a materially integral confession, he should explain to this latter that he has the duty of telling his sins in detail subsequently, and that when he next receives the sacrament of Penance under normal conditions (if such an opportunity will

[11] Cf. Wuest-Mullaney, *Matters Liturgical* (New York, 1942), n. 745.

[12] Damen, *Theologia moralis* (Rome, 1944), II, n. 305, I.

be granted him) he must confess explicitly any mortal sin with which he is now burdened and is acknowledging in a general way.

Even when there is no external obstacle to an integral confession, the confessor of one who is very sick or dying should be mindful of the sane principle of moral theology that in such a situation the quest for material integrity by the priest need not be so exacting as in the case of a penitent who enjoys good health.[13] If, for example, the priest realizes that by probing diligently for the exact number and species of the sins confessed he is disturbing and annoying the patient (and very likely getting only vague answers) he should content himself with more general declarations, even though they do not satisfy the conditions *per se* required for a proper confession. However, the priest should endeavor, with all the ability which he himself possesses and with trust in the grace assured his ministry through the sacrament of Holy Orders, to arouse in the penitent fervent contrition for all his sins. The motives for sorrow furnished by faith, especially the fear of eternal punishment and the love of God, should be convincingly proposed. As Prümmer wisely remarks: "Since contrition is much more necessary than a materially integral confession, the confessor coming to a sick person who is very weak should endeavor to elicit with him acts of true contrition rather than inquire about the material integrity of confession."[14]

A firm and sincere purpose of amendment is an essential factor of true contrition. *Per se* nothing more than a general intention of avoiding mortal sin and of fulfilling one's grave obligations is required. But at times a particular proposal is called for—namely, when there is a certain occasion of sin which looms large in the penitent's life and which can be renounced only by an extraordinary effort. The case which the hospital chaplain is most likely to encounter is that of the Catholic who is living with a partner to whom he is not validly married. In this event it is ordinarily necessary for the sick person to make an explicit declaration that he will have the marriage validated or abstain from further conjugal relations. Even though the priest himself is quite sure that the patient will never leave the hospital alive, such a declaration should usually be demanded, for it is the most telling indication that the patient is truly sorry for his sins.

[13] Cf. Cappello, *op. cit.*, II, n. 235.

[14] *Manuale theologiae moralis* (Friburg. Brisgov., 1936), n. 379.

Furthermore, when public scandal has been given by the irregular life of the dying Catholic, there should be a formal retractation before at least one witness. As is evident, if the patient is fast slipping out of life, and perhaps is even partially unconscious, nothing more than the general purpose of amendment is required.

It sometimes happens that a non-Catholic patient who is anxious to join the Catholic Church is involved in a matrimonial difficulty—for example, is divorced and remarried. It is quite possible that he is in good faith about the matter; the principles which heretofore guided his conduct did not forbid the dissolution of the marriage bond. Perhaps too, he entertains the näive idea that by entrance into the Catholic Church all defects in his marital status will be healed. To what extent can the priest allow such an individual to remain in good faith while accepting him into the Catholic Church? On the one hand, if there is any possibility that he will recover, he must be informed that he cannot become a Catholic unless he promises that he will no longer regard his present partner as his wife. On the other hand, if death is quite imminent and he is in a very debilitated condition, a general assurance that he will obey the laws of God and of the Church in the brief portion of life that remains will suffice. But, apart from this latter case, even when recovery is impossible, I believe that ordinarily he must be told that his present union is invalid and required to acquiesce to the consequences of this decision before he may be admitted as a convert. This must be done even if there is reason to fear that he may not enter the Church if this information is given him. For it would be a grave scandal if a man known to be living in a union not recognized as a marriage by the Catholic Church were admitted to that Church, apparently with the understanding that he is to be allowed to live in concubinage. Moreover, the explicit promise to do what is required of him in this matter is a very convincing manifestation of the sincerity of his conversion. At most, one could admit such a person to membership in the Catholic Church while retaining good faith about his marital status if three conditions are verified: (1) the fact that his present union is not a valid marriage must be unknown to the public; (2) it must be certain that he will die shortly; (3) there must be no doubt about the existence of complete good faith on this matter in his mind. As is quite

evident, the cases will be very rare in which all these conditions are verified.

The hospital chaplain should be aware of the power which the Church gives him to absolve from all sins and censures those who are in danger of death. However, in the event that the sick person recovers, he has the obligation to have recourse to the proper authorities to receive a mandate, provided he was under a censure *ab homine* or one most specially reserved to the Holy See.[15] There are four excommunications most specially reserved to the Holy See by common law—those inflicted for striking the Sovereign Pontiff, profanely casting aside or purloining the Blessed Sacrament, absolving an accomplice, and directly breaking the sacramental seal. When the law refers in this connection to "those in danger of death," it can be interpreted even of those who are only in probable danger. Moreover, if the priest feels that there are good reasons for not admonishing the penitent of the obligation to have subsequent recourse—as would usually be the case when it is quite sure that he will not recover—this admonition may be omitted. In the words of Fr. Bouscaren: "While this obligation exists, it need not *always* be explicitly urged upon the penitent by the confessor; this should be done only when the confessor feels that it will not unduly disturb the penitent."[16]

Some theologians allow the imparting of sacramental absolution to dying heretics, even while they still possess the use of their faculties—namely, when it is prudently judged that they have a general intention of using the necessary means of salvation instituted by Christ, yet cannot be admonished about conversion to the Catholic faith with any hope of success. Thus, Noldin believes that in such circumstances the sick man can be urged to make an act of faith (at least in the fundamental Christian truths) and an act of contrition, and to declare that he has sinned but desires to do all that God requires for his salvation. Then, Noldin adds, the priest could impart absolution without advising the patient of this fact.[17] Other theologians, however, deny the right of the priest to absolve a heretic as long as he retains the use

[15] Can. 882, 2252.

[16] *Canon Law* (Milwaukee, 1946), p. 822.

[17] Cf. Noldin, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Innsbruck, 1940), III, n. 297.

of reason, unless he gives some indication of a desire to enter the Catholic Church.[18] At any rate, if a priest accepts the former opinion as sufficiently probable to follow in practice, he must take good care that it does not induce him to lessen his efforts to convert well-meaning non-Catholics to the true faith when they are approaching the portals of eternity.

Finally, the hospital chaplain should be familiar with the canon of Church law which allows a confessor to commute the pious works required for the gaining of an indulgence into other works for the benefit of those who are unable to perform the prescribed acts because of some legitimate impediment.[19] This faculty the confessor can exercise for the benefit of the patients even outside the sacrament of Penance. However, the works which can be thus commuted seem to be only the ordinary conditions—confession, communion, prayers and visit to a church—not conditions which are substantial to the indulgence itself. Moreover, the visit to a church can be commuted only if the church to which the indulgence is attached is situated in the place where the sick person abides, so that the sickness is the only reason impeding the visit. Thus, the confessor could not, by virtue of this canon, commute attendance at a course of spiritual exercises to which an indulgence is attached; but he could commute the visit to a local church for the gaining of the *Portiuncula* indulgence into another work of piety which the sick person could perform, such as kissing the crucifix with an ejaculatory prayer.[20]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

[18] Cf. Damen, *op. cit.*, II, n. 337.
[19] Can. 935.
[20] Cf. Damen, *op. cit.*, II, n. 1127.

OUR LADY OF THE ROSARY

The Holy Virgin who once victoriously drove the terrible sect of the Albigenses from Christian countries will now, if we invoke her as suppliants, turn aside the new errors, especially those of Communism, which reminds us in many ways, by its motives and misdeeds, of the ancient ones.

—Pope Pius XI in *Ingravescentibus malis.*

BELLARMINE'S DEFENCE OF CANONIZED SAINTS

With two of his religious brethen being raised to the honors of the altar recently, if Robert Bellarmine were alive today he would very likely have re-edited his classic treatise on the canonization of the saints.[1] The errors against which it was originally directed are just as alive today as they were in the sixteenth century—only now our separated brethen ignore the saints instead of attacking them. In any case, Bellarmine's apologia of sanctity deserves to be better known. It forms a substantial part of his two-million-word "Controversies against the Reformers" which Pius XI declared to be the main reason, after his personal holiness, why Bellarmine was made a Doctor of the Universal Church.

St. Robert was not a polemicist by nature, but by force of circumstances. How could any red-blooded Tuscan remain silent when apostates like Martin Luther were openly charging that "The only persons being canonized are Popish saints, not Christian ones. The foundations made in their honor serve only to fatten lazy gluttons"? The story is told how on May 31, 1523, the Venerable Bishop Benno of Meissen was canonized by his fellow-countryman, the German Adrian VI. Luther was incensed in the extreme at the thought of the special celebration to be held the following year in honor of the new saint. He accordingly published his diatribe, "Against the new idol and olden devil about to be set up at Meissen." He vindicates his use of the term "devil" in the title on the very first page: "Now that by the grace of God, the Gospel has again arisen and shines brightly, Satan incarnate is avenging himself by means of such foolery and is causing himself to be worshipped with great pomp under the name of Benno."[2]

Bellarmine went to the heart of the Protestant opposition to canonized saints. It would be no use defending the Church's right to say that certain persons were in heaven if there was no heaven for them to enter. He quotes Calvin as saying that, "It

[1] Bl. John de Britto, S.J., missionary to India and martyr, and Bl. Bernardine Realino, S.J., famous Italian missionary and preacher, were canonized by the Holy Father on June 22, 1947.

[2] Grisar, *Martin Luther*, V, 123.

is stupid to inquire where the souls of the just now live and whether they are in glory or not. Sacred Scripture explicitly teaches us that they must all wait until the second coming of Christ before entering into their glory."[3] Bellarmine counters with a score of arguments, like the following excerpt from the Collect for the Mass of Gregory the Great: "O God, Who hast given to the soul of Thy servant Gregory the reward of eternal beatitude"; and the prayer of St. Paul when he exclaimed, "I wish to be dissolved and be with Christ." To which Bellarmine adds that if the souls of the saved are detained in some other place than heaven, Paul's desire would have been a Utopian dream since Christ is assuredly in heaven.

Having disposed of the heretical denial that the souls of the blessed are even now in heaven, St. Robert proceeds to defend the Church's custom of canonizing her heroic dead: "There is more than one problem we have to deal with here. Is there any reason why the saints should be canonized at all? If so, who has the power and the right to canonize them? And is his judgment infallible when he pronounces on their sanctity?"[4]

Before answering these questions, Bellarmine first explains what is meant by the process of canonization.

> Canonization is nothing else than the public testimony of the Church witnessing to the genuine sanctity and certain possession of heavenly glory of some person who has died. Consequently it is at once both a judgment pronounced on the saint himself and a statement issued on the honors which he should now receive as one of the elect who happily reigns with God.[5]

There are seven special and distinctive honors which the Church decrees in favor of those whom she raises to the dignity of sainthood:

> Persons who are canonized are thereby inscribed in the catalog of the saints, which means that the faithful are obliged to call them and to publicly worship them as saints. They are henceforth to be invoked in the public prayers of the Church. Churches and altars may be erected in their memory. The Sacrifice of the Eucharist and the Divine Office may be publicly offered to God in their honor. They are assigned a

---

[3] Calvin, *Institutes of the Christian Religion*, Bk. 4, chap. 25, no. 6.

[4] Bellarmine, *De beatitudine et canonizatione sanctorum*, lib. I, cap. 7.

[5] *Ibid.*

special feast day in the ecclesiastical calendar. Pictures and statues can be made of them, including a distinctive nimbus or halo to signify the glory which they now enjoy in heaven. And finally, their relics may be preserved in precious reliquaries and publicly honored.[6]

According to John Calvin, "It is idolatrous to worship in any degree any of the angels or so-called saints who have died."[7] That the worship of the saints is not idolatry is amply proved from the most ancient tradition of the Church. What Bellarmine is especially concerned with at this point is to show that the Church's apparently arbitrary procedure in canonizing certain people is not only not capricious but perfectly consistent with God's manifest will in dealing with mankind.

Take the Scriptures, for example. Just about every chapter of the historical books of the Old Testament describes the glorious exploits and heroic death of some great man—minutely detailed under the inspiring hand of God. In one small section of Ecclesiasticus, the author canonizes upwards of twenty holy men who had lived before his time: Henoch, Noe, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, Aaron, Phinees, Josue, Caleb, Samuel, David, Elias, Eliseus and others. In the New Testament we have the same thing. St. Luke in his Acts canonizes St. Stephen, the elder James, besides Peter, Paul, Silas and Barnabas. The least we can argue from Scriptural tradition, therefore, is that most probably God has not discontinued a practice which He had sanctioned and encouraged for thousands of years, up to and including Apostolic times.[8]

Moreover, on the direct authority of Holy Writ, we are bidden to honor saints, "Let the people show forth their wisdom and the Church declare their praise" (*Ecclus.*, 45:15). Apart from revelation, however, reason itself testifies that just as wickedness and sin deserve to be hated and blamed, so virtue and holiness should be rewarded with due recognition and praise:

Besides, the honor which we pay to the saints eventually redounds to our own advantage because they will repay our attentions by obtaining many graces for us through their powerful intercession with God. But how can we venerate the saints as we should, unless we first know who they are and can distinguish the true saints from those who are not saints at all?[9]

---

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] Calvin, *op. cit.* Bk. 1, chap. 11, no. 11.

[8] Bellarmine, *loc. cit.*

[9] *Ibid.*

A third element that enters into the picture is the duty of imitation:

The saints are so many models of virtue and norms of right conduct which God has given us to guide us in our course through life. But again, it is quite impossible to follow another person's example if we do not know who he is or what virtues he practiced and trials he underwent. We cannot imitate an abstract generality. To paraphrase a statement of Christ, the sanctity of the saints is the candle that must not be put under a bushel but upon a candlestick—which the Church literally fulfills every time she canonizes one of the elect of God.[10]

For all their sanctity, however, the saints are not so far removed from us as to cease to be our brethen in Christ.

We are all members of one Body, and consequently are expected to share each other's joys and sorrows. So that in God's plan the saints are destined to show us their sympathy and do what they can to relieve our needs. No doubt they fulfill their obligations in this regard most faithfully; and not only in a general sort of way but even to the extent of an individual saint caring for the needs of an individual person on earth. We on our part are supposed to join in their happiness and thank Almighty God for the glory which He has bestowed upon them; which is clearly difficult—not to say impossible—unless we know who the saints are, what heroic deeds they accomplished and wherein their dignity specifically consists.[11]

So much for the positive advantages of knowing definitely who is in heaven and why. By the same token a great many embarrassments—to put it mildly—are also avoided. Bellarmine writes:

Suppose for a moment that the Church did not explicitly identify definite people among the blessed as worthy of our veneration. The result would be confusion twice confounded. Real saints might possibly be recognized, but at the same time not a few of the damned would also be honored as saints. A case in point is what happened in the time of St. Martin, as related by the chronicler Sulpicius. For some inexplicable reason, the local townsfolk began to venerate a certain recently deceased individual as a martyr. The man was killed, it was true, but why? Martin suspected the whole business, made extensive investigations but could reach no definite conclusions until in answer to his prayers the "martyr" appeared to him in a dream and identified himself. He was not a

[10] *Ibid.* [11] *Ibid.*

martyr but a thief who had fallen victim to his own misdeeds and was now condemned to suffer the pains of hell for all eternity.[12]

The heresiarch Luther, whom St. Robert was answering, had brazenly proclaimed that "Every man is free to canonize as much as he pleases."[13] The practical question suggests itself, therefore: is Luther correct or not? And if not, who does have the power to canonize the saints? Bellarmine distinguishes two kinds of canonization, depending on whether a person is to be considered a saint only in his own province and locality, or whether his sanctity is to be proclaimed to the whole Christian world. In the latter case, not only is the person's holiness officially testified to all the faithful but they are also forbidden under censure to call his sanctity into question—which would not be true, absolutely speaking, where a saint is honored only locally.

Bellarmine is also careful to point out the difference between historical practice and objective privilege in "canonizing" territorial saints. According to ancient authorities. an ordinary bishop was permitted to canonize a saint for veneration in his own episcopal territory.

We read in one of St. Cyprian's letters, for example, where he orders his priests to inform him when someone is martyred for the Faith that he may immediately celebrate the Holy Sacrifice in his honor and assign the date of his death as a special feast in the calendar of the diocese. We also know that in olden days there were hundreds of saintly persons whose memory was honored in one or another province but who were quite unknown outside the immediate locality where they lived and died. To take only a single instance of this, we are told in the Acts of the Council of Florence that the Greeks honored Simeon Metaphrastes as a saint, whereas the Latins were surprised to learn that the worthy man had ever existed! However, this *was* the custom, which has since been prohibited because of the many abuses to which it gave rise. Since the time of Alexander III and Innocent III no one may be even locally venerated as a saint unless and until his cult has been formally approved by the Roman Pontiff.[14]

But when it comes to canonizing a person for the Universal Church,

All the authorities agree that this power belongs to no one under the Sovereign Pontiff. Quite reasonably, because it finally rests in his hands

---

[12] *Ibid.* [13] Grisar, *loc. cit.* [14] Bellarmine, *op. cit.*, cap. 8.

as the head of the Church to propose to the whole Church what her members are to believe and what they are to do in the practice of their religion. We make no scruple about saying that the Pope has the power of declaring what persons are excommunicated and ordering the faithful to treat them as such; why then should we derogate from him the corresponding power of declaring what people are saints and commanding all the faithful to honor them accordingly?[15]

The Reformers of Bellarmine's day denied the power of the Pope to canonize the saints because, so they said, there are so many saints in the Roman Liturgy who have never been canonized by the Popes. If, therefore, the Church honors as saints those whom she has never canonized, what need is there of Popish canonizations at all? Bellarmine is willing to concede the historical fact but violently rejects the specious conclusions that the Protestants draw from it. According to his calculation, the first papal canonization on record took place under Pope Leo III, about the year 816, when he inscribed St. Suibert in the canon of the saints and assigned September 4 as his feast day. He quotes a manuscript of the historian Surius in support of his claim. Now the problem:

Thomas of Canterbury, Dominic and Francis of Assisi have been duly canonized by the Popes. But what about the objection of the Reformers on all the saints before this time? Is there anything to it? Not much. These ancient saints began to be venerated by the Universal Church not in virtue of any single positive legislation but through immemorial custom. And legitimate custom, as we know from St. Thomas, has the moral force of law when the ruler of a given society gives at least his tacit consent to the custom in question. Consequently the worship of any saint which may have begun as a local custom, once it becomes accepted by the Church as a whole *and* the Sovereign Pontiff either tacitly or explicitly approves the practice, becomes *ipso facto* an ecclesiastical law binding in conscience on all believing Christians.[16]

Here again the heretical camp is divided against the Catholic position. It was John Wyclif's conviction, quoted by Bellarmine, that, "The Pope is no more infallible when he pretends to canonize a saint than the King of Ethiopia or the Sultan of Turkey would be if they made the same pretense."[17] Luther's main difficulty against canonizing people was that it went counter to Sacred Scripture: "Before Judgment Day we are told, 'to pro-

[15] *Ibid.* [16] *Ibid.* [17] Bellarmine, *op. cit.*, cap. 9.

nounce no man holy.' " And although Luther had to back down somewhat to recognize the undoubted sanctity of men like Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, Bernard and Francis, still he would not, he said, stake his life on it, seeing there was nothing about them in Holy Scripture. "The Pope, nay all the angels of heaven, have not the power of setting up a new article of faith which is not contained in Scripture."[18]

Needless to say, the Catholic doctrine is just the opposite. It is thus expressed by Bellarmine:

> We hold that the Church does not err in the canonization of her saints. Proofs for this are not difficult to find. If we were ever granted the privilege of doubting whether a canonized saint is really a saint or not, we should also have the liberty of doubting whether he has to be worshipped or not. But this, to borrow a phrase from Augustine, would be dogmatic suicide because then we should be allowed to call into question whether we have to do anything that the whole Church of Christ is doing.

Furthermore, if the Church could make a mistake in her canonizations, at least two serious evils would result.

> On the one hand, those among the canonized who were not in heaven would be deprived of all the suffrages of the living since we are forbidden to pray for the repose of the souls of canonized saints. "We do the martyrs an injustice when we pray for them," says St. Augustine. The same holds for all the canonized, according to the teaching of Innocent III. On the other hand, people on earth would be deprived of the intercession of many of the saints because as often as not they would be paying their respects to the souls in hell instead of those in heaven. What is worse, the Church would be calling down on herself the most dreadful maledictions every time she prayed that God might grant us His graces according to the glory He has bestowed on those whom we honor as saints.[19]

The whole supposition of the enemies of the Church is that she raises men and women to the honors of the altar without warrant and independently of any investigation. If anything, the Church could be accused of over-severity in this respect. She demands a specified number of well-authenticated and outstanding miracles as the ordinary indispensable condition for canonization.

[18] Grisar, *loc. cit.*

[19] Bellarmine, *op. cit.*, cap. 9.

No intelligent person would, for example, question the historical existence of Julius Caesar or Pompey simply because historians commonly agree that Caesar and Pompey actually lived. Historians are human and therefore liable to error and deception, and yet we believe them. Are we to give less credence to Almighty God who is Infinite Wisdom and Truth Itself, when He testifies to the sanctity of one of His elect and confirms His testimony with incontestable miracles—especially when there is no reason why the person's sanctity should even be suspected in the first place?[20]

It is interesting to note, by way of contrast, what an abysmal difference there was between Bellarmine's attitude towards the saints and the attitude of Luther and his followers whom Bellarmine was opposing. Hartmann Grisar writes of Luther:

His opposition to the canonization of the saints was dictated by his hatred of all veneration of the saints and by his aversion to the ideal of Christian self-denial, submissive obedience to the Church and Catholic activity of which the canonized saints are models. Nowhere else is his attempt to destroy the sublime ideal of Christian life which he failed to understand and to drag down to the gutter all that was highest, so clearly apparent as here. Striving after great holiness on the part of the individual merely tended to derogate from Christ's work; the Evangelical Counsels fostered only a mistaken desertion of the world. Real saints must be "good lusty sinners who do not blush to insert in the Our Father, the: Forgive us our trespasses."[21]

Bellarmine thought otherwise. His devotion to the saints was proverbial. Typical is the following from one of his annual panegyrics for the feast of St. Ignatius Loyola, preached on the text from the Psalms: "The just man will continue in everlasting remembrance."

Although everyone naturally desires to be remembered after his death, and not a few try to achieve this sort of immortality in the buildings, monuments, paintings and books which they produce—in God's providence only the saints will ever attain to an honorable remembrance in the hearts of those who follow them. And apart from the glory which the hallowed memory of the saints brings to God whose beauty they reflect, it is also very beneficial to ourselves. The saints, more than anyone else, teach us that a life of perfect virtue is not so impossible after all. They are a living witness to the truth of

[20] *Ibid.*

[21] Grisar, *op. cit.*, V, 124.

Christ's own words that for those who are seriously willing to co-operate with His grace, His yoke is not only not bitter or harsh but pleasant and sweet and easy to bear."[22]

JOHN A. HARDON, S. J.

West Baden College,
West Baden Springs, Indiana

[22] Bellarmine, *Exhortationes domesticae* (Rome, July 31, 1605).

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the April, 1898, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review,* Abbé Hogan, S.S., in pursuance of his series on *Clerical Studies,* discusses "The Training in Biblical Studies." He believes that the seminary course in Sacred Scripture should extend over four or five years, the lectures varying from two to five a week. He recommends that students who manifest a special aptitude for scriptural studies be given extra opportunties for the development of their talents through academies and seminars. . . . Fr. G. Tyrrell, S.J., of England, writing on "Sacerdotalism in the Catholic Church," explains the office of the priest in mediating and in offering sacrifice. (There seeems to be no indication of those errors which a decade later excluded the unfortunate writer from the Catholic Church). . . . Fr. Edward McSweeney, discussing the loneliness of the country priest, under the title "The Crux of the Priestly Life," recommends that priests stationed in small rural parishes take up some form of regular manual labor, such as agriculture or carpentry. . . . A correspondent who signs himself "Nicodemus" complains that the usual pictures of Our Lord's Resurrection are incorrect, in that they portray the stone already rolled away from the entrance to the tomb. To depict this miracle exactly, he says, a picture should represent the stone still closing the sepulchre, and Christ coming out through the stone; and the guards should be looking in the direction in which He is, seeing the door but not seeing the Saviour, for Christ was visible after His Resurrection only to those to whom He chose to manifest Himself. . . . A writer who uses the pen name of "A Vincentian Missionary" gives his ideas on the problem of our young men. He asserts that the formation of clubs and societies, though beneficial to some extent, is likely to wean our youth away from the home. He advocates the building up of Catholic home life, especially through the establishment of the Holy Family Confraternity, which affords an opportunity of regular instructions on the duties of home life.

F. J. C.

THE ORDEAL OF FATHER WALL

Part III

Maybe he should have let the old boy freeze, at that. No, that was not a charitable thought. He had his crotchety ways, but on the whole he was not such a bad sort. Besides, beggars could not be choosers. When a man had a wife and kids depending on him he had to be thinking about making a living, and odd jobs had not been plentiful. It was rather a lucky break for him, Faber thought, as he trudged through the rain from the school to the church, that the other fellow had not known how to handle that cranky furnace.

Fr. Wall, watching Faber from the window, thought to himself that it had been a good idea to get him back. He was much better at taking care of things around the place than the other man had been. Take that furnace, now, he had known how to nurse it along so that a man got some heat out of it. The winter had been unusually cold and he had felt it all the more coming back as he had from the South right into the worst of it. He should really have had that furnace fixed, or a new one installed, before this, but with prices what they were he did not want to spend the money. No use being gypped.

Those busybodies, too, should stop wagging their tongues about his treatment of Faber. Hadn't he given the man his job back? That was more than generous of him, considering the condition in which he had left the church that time when the Bishop came around. He wondered to himself whether those cranks had gone to the Bishop with their stories. He had heard nothing as yet from the Ordinary, but you never knew what people were liable to say about a priest. He hoped the Bishop had sense enough not to go overboard for a pack of lies. No news was good news, anyway. If there had been anything against him he supposed he would have heard by now. At any rate, if anything was said he would be able to point out that there was nothing in what they charged, for there was Faber, big as life, back on the job; and doing a good job, too. He was rather glad in a way, that he had given him the raise to get him back, for he was really a very good and conscientious workman.

* * * * *

A knock sounded on the door of the Bishop's office and in came the secretary with the file on Fr. Wall. Looking over his notes from the previous study of the case, the Bishop proceeded to check further through the dossier. He had heard that Faber was back at work in the parish as janitor and that he had been given a raise. That should have stilled the talk against Fr. Wall, and to some extent it had; but there were still some complaints, so it would be wise to have a complete picture of the situation in his mind.

There had been no indications of anything against faith or morals in the Jordan parish. At any rate, there had been nothing unusual reported. The Bishop wondered, however, how well Fr. Wall was observing the command of Canon Law to be diligently on guard lest anything contrary to faith and morals be taught in his parish, especially in schools both public and private. He began to ponder, too, whether Fr. Wall was fostering or setting up works of charity, faith and piety.[1] As for works of piety, the various parish devotions seemed to be flourishing. There was no nocturnal adoration, nor anything like that; but in a place the size of Jordan it would probably be rather difficult to find enough men to handle it.

The Confraternity of Christian Doctrine had been set up in the Jordan parish, as in all the other parishes of the diocese, pursuant to his letter which he had issued in 1935 after reading the Decree on Catechetical Instruction issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Council on Jan. 12, 1935.[2] The Bishop turned to the list of names of members of that Confraternity in Fr. Wall's parish. There was merely a list of names without indication of the backgrounds of the people mentioned. The Bishop knew that some of them were school-teachers, skilled in teaching children, but he made a note to have future reports show what qualifications each member had for teaching catechism. Of course, where the Sisters bore the brunt of catechetical instructions the members of the Confraternity would not have so much to do, but there was no point in loading the organization with names of people who were willing, but not particularly capable of explaining the doctrines of the Faith to the children whom they were supposed to teach.

[1] Cf. Can. 469.

[2] *AAS*, XXVII, 145; cf. also Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest*, II, 412.

A lot of good souls would certainly volunteer for anything as important as this Confraternity, which was the most important of the parish sodalities, according to the Sacred Congregation of the Council, but if they were to be just names on a list, dead weight, padding, to make it look good to the Chancery Office, they might better be dropped in favor of a few who knew how to teach. The list from Fr. Wall's parish was rather long, but the Bishop wondered whether all those who were capable of teaching catechism were listed.

The classes in catechism in the parish school seemed to fulfill the requirements of the Decree for the teaching of the children and young people, that under the guidance of the pastor himself and according to a prescribed method they might learn the rudiments of the divine law and of the Faith. There might be question as to those who did not attend the parochial school because of the distance or some other legitimate excuse. They were brought in for classes in preparation for the reception of the sacraments of Penance and Confirmation, as the Decree required, that he knew; but were these classes enough to enable them to attain the degree of knowledge of their Faith which they should have to lead good Catholic lives?

As for those who had received their First Communion, did Fr. Wall give them that better and more complete catechetical instruction which the Decree called for? If they were in the school, they received further instruction from the Sisters, of course; but those who lived at a distance might not have such good care taken of their continuing needs for instruction. It did not appear from the list of members of the Confraternity in the parish whether they all lived in the town or whether some lived in the country districts where they could easily gather the children around them for further study of the Faith. The Bishop made a note to have that indication on the next report about the Confraternity to be sent in.

Another point which would need to be checked was whether Fr. Wall had been diligent in warning parents, and god-parents too, of their grave obligation to see to it that all persons subject to them or committed to their care be instructed in Christian Doctrine.[3] He, undoubtedly, like all the other pastors, reminded the people at the opening of school in the fall of their obligation

[3] Cf. Can. 1335.

to give their children a Catholic education; but did he consider the case of those who, being excused from attendance at the parish school, would need to have other provision made for their instruction in matters of Faith? Did he remind the parents of these children of their duty to teach them, or, if incapable of such teaching themselves, to send or bring their children to the church for instruction, or at least, to the member of the Confraternity who was holding classes under the pastor's direction in their neighborhood—provided there was such a class?

Did Fr. Wall make it interesting for the children to come to parish instruction in catechism? The Decree seemed to indicate that this was to be done; but how often was it not true that coming for instruction was a chore for the children, something which they did not relish any more than they did the other chores which they had to perform around their homes. It should be a pleasure to learn about God and the things of God, but was this the case for the children of the Jordan parish?

The Bishop had to admit that when he had questioned the children in Fr. Wall's parish they had answered well, or at least no worse than did the children of other parishes. Was that, however, enough? The questions on such occasions were of necessity more or less simple and routine. There was neither time nor opportunity to go into much detail; still, it would be the detailed questions asked by outsiders which would give the people the greatest trouble in the years to come.

The provision for the years to come, contemplated by the Decree in question, was that pastors should explain the catechism to adults among the faithful, as required by Can. 1332. Pope Pius X, in his Encyclical *Acerbo nimis*[4] had said that they were to use the Catechism of the Council of Trent, in such a way as to cover in four or five years all the matter relating to the creed, the sacraments, the ten commandments, prayer, and the commandments of the Church. To this the Decree added also the matter on the evangelical counsels, grace, the virtues, sin, and the four last things. All of this would have been covered by Fr. Wall if he used regularly the outline suggested from the diocesan office for sermons on catechetical subjects.

Calling the Diocesan Catechetical Office, the Bishop found that so far as the director there knew Fr. Wall was provided with the

[4] April 15, 1905; cf. *Fontes C.J.C.*, III, 647, §16, n. VI.

outline and was following it. There was no satisfactory information as to just how often and how well he used that outline. The Bishop made a note to check on that point, too, and to find out just how much catechism the adults of the parish were getting to keep them informed of the doctrines of their Faith, especially in relation to current problems of morality and theoretical discussions.

Christian doctrine was being taught in the various parishes, schools, and colleges in the diocese in the way that was traditional in the Church. Of that the Bishop was certain. Whether all the teachers in the Jordan parish were suitable was a point on which he intended to check. The Diocesan Catechetical Office informed him that representatives of the parish in question had been regular attendants at the catechetical meetings in the diocese at which the best means of promoting catechetical instruction were discussed. The director did not, however, recall that the people from Fr. Wall's parish had been very active in the discussions. They were simply present like most of those at the meeting to listen in silence to what the speakers said, without offering comments or suggestions of their own.

The special series of lessons in religion provided every year by the Catechetical Office for the fuller and better training of those who taught Christian doctrine in the parochial and public schools was sent to each person on the list of catechists received from each parish in the diocese. How well they used those series of lessons did not appear clearly from the reports which came in, but the Director supposed that they were using them as the simplest and easiest approach to the problem of teaching what was assigned for that year.

It was one of the functions of the Deans to visit and inspect all the classes of religion in the diocese and report fully on the results, the progress, or the defects of the religious instruction given. The reports of the Dean in whose district the Jordan parish was situated did not give much beyond a general approval of the work being done.

The Catechetical Day seemed to be observed in the Jordan parish as it was elsewhere. The people came to Mass, received Holy Communion, and prayed to obtain in greater measure the blessing of divine instruction. The sermon suggested by the Decree was given on the necessity of catechetical instruction and

parents especially were warned to teach their own children and send them to the parish instructions. Pamphlets sent out from the diocesan office were distributed to the people and a collection was taken up for the promotion of catechetical work. That was about the extent of the observance, and it did not appear how effective the whole procedure was.

This matter of catechetical instruction for members of the parish not in the parochial school, either because they lived so far away or were excused for some other reason, or because they had outgrown the school, was one which would call for a much more detailed study. Had Fr. Wall kept up with the directives sent out from the Chancery Office and the Diocesan Catechetical Office in this regard?

The Bishop recalled from his last visitation of the Jordan parish that Fr. Wall had the usual parish books and kept them accurately,[5] noting in the book of Baptisms whether the person had received Confirmation, had contracted marriage, had been ordained a sub-deacon, or had made a solemn religious profession.[6] That he had kept the books up to date appeared from the authentic copies sent in each year to the Chancery Office.[7] The parish archives, too, were in order, he recalled.[8] There was nothing to be objected against Fr. Wall on this score, at least.

Fr. Wall, he knew, too, was also accustomed to preach on all Sundays and holydays during the year. While he might have some one come in to preach for a special occasion like Forty Hours Devotion or a Mission, he usually was in the pulpit himself.

Those who were called in to preach had always been either diocesan priests already approved by the Bishop for preaching in the diocese or priests for whom he had obtained faculties in accordance with the Norms for Sacred Preaching issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Consistory, June 28, 1917.[9]

The pastor had been good about sending in the proposed preacher's name two months in advance, so that the Bishop would have time to obtain any information about the man which he desired. In fact, Fr. Wall had been most co-operative and had included most of the necessary information in his letter requesting permission for the man to preach. This had made it easy for

[5] Cf. Can. 470, §1.
[6] Cf. Can. 470, §2.
[7] Cf. Can. 470, §3.
[8] Cf. Can. 470, §4.
[9] *AAS*, IX, 328; cf. also Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest*, I, 622 ff., nn. 4-5.

the Chancery Office to prepare a written permission for the extra-diocesan preachers, designating the place and kind of preaching for which it was granted, and mail it back to the pastor in plenty of time for the sermon which was to be given. The Bishop appreciated the thoughtfulness of Fr. Wall in this matter, for it had given him time to satisfy his grave obligation in conscience to give such permission only to those who were pious, learned, and fit, by communicating with the proposed preacher's proper Ordinary or Superior and obtaining a favorable answer, as was usually the case.

Of course, the last examination, written and oral, which Fr. Wall had undergone as to his fitness for preaching, had been taken some years ago. The three examiners had apparently found him qualified, for the former Bishop had entrusted to him a parish with the obligation of preaching connected with the office of pastor. Since then nothing had come up to indicate that his original fitness had disappeared. The former Bishop, too, had apparently been satisfied as to Fr. Wall's piety, purity of life, and reputation as rendering him fit to preach the word of God.

At any rate, Fr. Wall had been declared qualified in general for preaching and without limit as to time, trial period, or conditions. The file showed a general *pagella* for preaching, exactly like that for hearing confessions.

Since sacred things, the Norms said,[10] were to be treated sacredly, no one should undertake to preach unless he had made due proximate preparation by study and prayer. The Bishop sat back and tapped his pencil on the desk while he speculated how many of the preachers of the diocese were observing that prescription of the Sacred Congregation. It was so easy to get into a rut and go on year after year mouthing the same phrases from some half-forgotten Retreat, or repeating the words of some great preacher who would himself have been horrified to think of approaching the pulpit without something of importance carefully thought out to meet the needs of the particular congregation he was to address.

The subjects treated in sermons should be essentially sacred,[11] the Norms said, and apparently Fr. Wall was not inclined to

[10] Cf. Norms, §19.

[11] Cf. Can. 1347.

deviate on that point. He had never had occasion to ask and obtain permission from the Bishop to treat of something not strictly sacred, though not unbecoming the house of God. He never spoke of politics in church, but then, neither did any of the other priests of the diocese. They all knew better than to do a thing like that.[12]

The funeral sermon was pretty much a thing of the past in his territory, the Bishop reflected. That was just as well, for the Norms stated that no one should deliver funeral sermons unless with the explicit permission beforehand of the Ordinary. They said also that he could, before giving his consent, require that the manuscript be submitted to him.[13]

Fr. Wall, in the last sermon the Bishop had heard him preach, had been pretty good in his use of Scripture texts, as St. Jerome recommended to Nepotianus,[14] "The speech of a priest should be seasoned with the reading of the Scriptures." He hadn't quoted particularly from the Fathers and Doctors of the Church. There was so much in the works of those men, the Bishop reflected, which could be used as a guide in solving problems of the present day. Human nature did not change over the years and what those giants of a by-gone century faced and conquered was simply rehashed more or less expertly by the opponents of Christianity and tossed out at a later date. A man who was thoroughly acquainted with their problems and their answers to those problems would have a head start in trying to solve his own problems as a leader of Christ's flock in these latter day trials.

Perhaps Fr. Wall was not so much to blame, however, for his failure to use the treasures of the past, for there had not been too many readable collections of the works of those Fathers available. Some translations were being made now, the Bishop knew, but did Fr. Wall know of them? To expect him to sit down and read the works in the original Latin or Greek after all the years he had been away from the books was perhaps expecting too much. A wiser man would have kept up on those languages, perhaps, but there would still have been the difficulty of obtaining those expensive sets of books with the Latin and Greek texts. He could purchase sets for the seminary library and then have a lending system set up, he supposed. Perhaps he should have done that. At least, then there would have been less excuse for the

[12] Cf. Norms, §20. [13] Cf. Norms, §21. [14] Cf. Norms, §22.

priests of the diocese being unfamiliar with the leaders of Christian thought in previous generations, leaders whose place they now had to assume.

The next paragraph of the Norms[15] struck the Bishop's eye. Quotations and authorities of profane writers should be used very sparingly; and the saying of heretics, apostates, and infidels, even more so. Persons who were still living should never be cited as authorities. The Faith and Christian morality did not need such champions and defenders, the Congregation said. As the Bishop recalled Fr. Wall's sermon there echoed again in his ears the ringing pentameters of Shakespeare, which Wall so loved to roll upon his tongue.

Fr. Wall did not, however, strike him as a man who sought especially the applause of his audiences. He seemed, rather, sincerely concerned for the salvation of souls and to have the approval of God and of the Church.[16] A mere indication of the greater appropriateness of quotations from the Fathers would no doubt be sufficient to restrain any excessive reference to profane authors.

The Bishop passed with a smile over the next paragraph[17] which condemned the practice of using printed placards before the sermon to gather an audience or afterwards to extol the merits of the preacher. The other priests of the diocese would make short work of anyone who tried any such tactics, he was sure. The Bishop could just imagine the reaction of some of the sharper-tongued wits to any such display. It would give them an opportunity too good to be missed.

Again the advice was good which St. Jerome gave to Nepotianus and which the Norms quoted in paragraph 26, "I would not have you be a declaimer, a bawler and chatterer without reason, but rather one who has pondered the mysteries and is well instructed in the sacraments of God. To pour out words and to gain the admiration of the crowd by rapid talking is the mark of an ignorant man . . . Nothing is so easy as to deceive by mere fluency of talk the rabble and the ignorant crowd which admires whatever it does not understand." Fr. Wall was not, however, quite the type St. Jerome envisioned. He did not overwhelm the people with a flood of words. If anything, the people had not

[15] Cf. Norms, §23. [16] Cf. Norms, §24. [17] Cf. Norms, §25.

seemed too impressed by his sermon, which the Bishop recalled having heard, but were merely politely attentive.

The next paragraph of the Norms was more to the point, however,[18] for some of Wall's language did not seem to fit the suggestion that he accommodate himself to the grasp of his hearers, both in thought and in the use of words. Some of the terms he had used were quite probably over the heads of the congregation. Maybe that was why they had not responded more to his approach to them. Technical terms which the priests in the sanctuary understood well enough were probably quite unintelligible to the people without further explanation, either then and there in the sermon, or at least in those classes in adult catechism which they had apparently not attended or had not profited by, since they did not seem to follow all that he said.

Fr. Wall had done his share of preaching around the diocese and elsewhere when invited to do so, but he was hardly to be charged with turning sacred preaching to profit, seeking the things that were his own and not the things that were Christ's. The Norms warned[19] that a preacher should not be eager for filthy lucre, nor permit himself to be ensnared by the lure of vainglory. There was nothing here on which to criticize Fr. Wall, so far as the Bishop could recall.

The prelate decided that he might have to caution the pastor about the use of profane writers for quotable material. He could, of course, suggest the use of some of the new books coming out with translations of the works of the Fathers. That would provide the old man with a workable substitute and might even give him some new ideas which would improve his preaching. For that suggestion he should be grateful, if it were put to him in a nice way.

If Fr. Wall was going to have to be moved from the Jordan parish that would take him out of the position of preaching there. There was apparently nothing to be said about his manner of life or anything else whereby even without his own fault he might have lost his reputation before the public so that his ministry became useless or harmful. The people were criticizing the man, but not in a way which would make it necessary to step in with such an overt act as forbidding him to preach for a time.[20]

[18] Cf. Norms, §27. [19] Cf. Norms, §28. [20] Cf. Norms, §31.

The Committee of Vigilance for Preaching listed in the Directory had no report on the preaching of Fr. Wall. Looking further, the Bishop discovered that they seemed to have no reports on the preaching of any one else. That was not in keeping with the suggestion of the Norms in paragraph 32. The Bishop made a note to have something done about that.

The Deans, too, he reflected, could be doing a better job in reporting the observance of the Norms in the parts of the diocese where neither he nor the Committee could be present to hear what was being said. All this was in accord with paragraph 33, after all. Did the Deans fully realize their responsibility in this regard? He would have to get out a letter to remind them of this.

Thought of the Deans reminded the prelate that he had not yet named a successor to the Dean of the district in which the Jordan parish was situated. Fr. Leopold Warmenhuis was a good, steady, dependable man. He would be conscientious about sending in all the required reports. The priests liked him and visited frequently at his rectory. They knew him for a serious, sometimes blunt man, but they felt more than respect, a real liking in fact, for the man. He was one of the old-timers, too, and was deserving of recognition for all that he had done for the diocese.

Calling his secretary, the Bishop instructed him to get a letter out to Fr. Warmenhuis notifying him of his appointment. The secretary had brought in a stack of letters to be signed, so the prelate laid aside for the time being the file on Fr. Wall.

As he left the room, the secretary asked whether he should include in the letter the appointment of Fr. Warmenhuis as a member of the Council of Vigilance. All the usual matters mentioned in a letter of appointment of a Rural Dean were to be included in this one, the Bishop assured him, and began to sign the letters on his desk.

* * * * *

Of course, it was nice that the janitor had his job back again, the ladies agreed over their bridge tables, but wasn't it a shame that he should be pushed around so from pillar to post? They knew that he could not very well refuse to take the job back when it was offered to him, for after all he did have his wife and family to think of, and they had been having such a hard time of it after he was fired from his position of janitor, though Mrs. Faber did so well about managing, poor dear. What would they ever have

done without her ability to make ends meet on his poor salary? She took such good care of the children, too, and all without much to go on, and with prices what they were nowadays it was a perfect miracle what she had been able to do, no one else was able to find such bargains, though of course what you got at bargain prices was not so nourishing, and the family had begun to look a little peaked of late, but that was not her fault, poor thing.

But what if Fr. Wall decided to fire the man again? There could not be much satisfaction in being in a job and not knowing what minute it all might come to an end. That wasn't a bit nice of Fr. Wall to treat a faithful man like Faber the way he had. It was nice that he had taken him back, of course; but you just couldn't trust him to keep the man. He might change at any time. In fact, Faber might be out of a job again this very minute.

A carefully worded telephone call which did not deceive Mrs. Faber reassured the ladies that Faber was quite well and was in fact over at the school at that very minute cleaning up after the children and Sisters had left for the day. Mrs. Faber agreed, too, that she did not know which was worse, the snow that had piled so high during the winter, or the rain which kept pouring down now, making rivers out of the streets. She was so glad they had called, and hoped that they were having a good time. She herself had to get supper started because Mr. Faber would be in shortly to eat before getting the church ready for the evening devotions.

(*To be continued*)

THOMAS OWEN MARTIN

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE PRIEST AND THEOLOGY

It is necessary that the priest, even among the absorbing tasks of his charge, and ever with a view to it, should continue his theological studies with unremitting zeal. The knowledge acquired at the seminary is indeed a sufficient foundation with which to begin, but it must be grasped more thoroughly and perfected.

—Pope Pius XI, in *Ad Catholici sacerdotii.*

THE NEW DIOCESES OF CHINA

The recent establishment of the hierarchy in China by no means implies the withdrawal of that country from the jurisdiction of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda. Canon 252, which defines the competency of that Congregation, states as follows: "*Huic Congregationi sunt etiam subiectae regiones, quae etsi hierarchia inibi constituta sit, adhuc inchoatum aliquid praeseferunt.*"

India and Japan, countries which have been very much in the news these days, are other examples of lands where the hierarchy has been established while the areas still remain under Propaganda. On Sept. 1, 1886, Pope Leo XIII established the hierarchy in India; and on Feb. 24, 1887, the Apostolic Delegate solemnly proclaimed the establishment at a meeting of the vicars apostolic of northern India, assembled in Saint Joseph's Cathedral Allahabad.[1] On June 15, 1891, the ecclesiastical hierarchy was established in Japan; at that time, three dioceses—Hakodate, Osaka, and Nagasaki—were created, while Tokyo was made an archdiocese and metropolitan see.[2]

In China, as in other countries, questions will arise concerning the canonical status of former quasi-parishes, particularly with respect to those areas of former vicariates and prefectures that were not erected into quasi-parishes.

The solution of these questions will be found in a decree of the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda, of Dec. 9, 1920, entitled, *De definiendis limitibus paroeciarum in diocesibus S. Congregationi de Propaganda Fide subiectis.*[3]

The decree, addressed primarily to the Church in India, informs us that certain doubts on the juridical status of their missions were submitted to the Sacred Congregation by Ordinaries of regions in which the hierarchy had been established but which were still subject to the Sacred Congregation of Propaganda. In order to settle these doubts and at the same time to ensure a sound method of procedure, the Sacred Congregation declared:

[1] *Missiones catholicae 1922*, pp. 49 ff.

[2] *Missiones catholicae 1922*, p. 253.

[3] *Sylloge*, n. 85.

(1) Inasmuch as the dioceses subject to the Congregation of Propaganda must be regarded as missions, it is permissible to leave some portions of the territory undivided; that is to say, without their having been given definite parochial limits.

(2) Such divisions of the territory as have already been assigned definite territorial limits or shall hereafter be so defined according to canon 216, are to be called parishes. To them, however, shall be applied the prescriptions of Canon Law on quasi-parishes.

(3) The mission bishops are given the special faculty to appoint regulars to parishes when secular priests are not available for such benefices.

The decree went on to state:

(4) The bishops of India, in their next meeting at Madras, and after having consulted the Most Reverend Apostolic Delegate, may settle on what sections of their respective territorties may be considered as having already been divided into distinct territorial divisions according to canon 216. For the erection of new parishes, the Ordinaries shall henceforth use the method prescribed in an earlier Instruction of the Congregation, dated July 25, 1920.[4]

In accordance with this decree, therefore, it is not required that the entire area of the recently established dioceses in China be immediately divided into parishes. Once the division has been made, canonical parishes come into being; but, as we have previously pointed out, Propaganda permits the legislation of the Code on quasi-parishes to be made applicable to them. Accordingly, therefore, all pastors of quasi-parishes are movable.[5] They are obliged to apply the *missa pro populo* eleven times a year on the days specified in canon 306.[6]

Canons 1095 and 1096 are applicable from the moment of the erection of the parish. However, in those parts of the diocese alluded to above—namely, where parishes have not yet been established—the decree permits the procedure authorized in an earlier Instruction of Propaganda, on July 25, 1920: "*Circa erectionem quasi-paroeciarum in Vicariatibus et Praefecturis Apostolicis.*" This procedure permits the bishop gradually to divide the territory into parishes, leaving the division of the rest of the territory to some future time.

[4] *Ibid.*, n. 82. [5] Canon, 454, §4. [6] Canon 466, §1.

Rectors of the mission stations in the yet undivided areas of the diocese have the juridicial status of curates (*vicarii cooperatores*) of the bishop. They may receive from him general delegation to assist validly and licitly at marriages in the territory assigned to them, in which they exercise the care of souls.[7]

To entrust parishes to regulars would ordinarily require an apostolic indult.[8] The Congregation again permits the mission bishops, as it once did the bishops of the United States, to appoint regular pastors without an apostolic indult.[9]

The erection of parishes is to be done by a decree of the Ordinary, and in that decree the territorial limits of the parish should be clearly defined. Where such an exact description is not practical, it is sufficient to indicate the various Christianities that belong to the parish; but the decree should state which church is the principal one of the parish, and which location is the residence of the pastor.[10] Two copies of this decree are to be made; one of which shall be kept in the archives of the diocese, the other in the records of the parish.[11]

There is no reason why a bishop may not erect into a parish an extensive area in which two, three, or more priests are working, one of whom is the canonical pastor while the others are appointed as his curates (*vicarii cooperatores*). For, as canon 476, § 2, states, curates may be appointed either for the entire parish or for a certain part of it. Thus in some countries the pastor lives by himself, with each curate being responsible for a specified part of the parish and each with his own household establishment.

Another pertinent document is a communication of the Cardinal Prefect of Propaganda to the Apostolic Delegate of Australia and New Zealand. In this document, the Cardinal declares that *in favorabilibus* all the territories under the jurisdiction of the Sacred Congregation, including Australia and New Zealand, are to be regarded as missions just as they have been on

[7] Instruction S.C.P.F., July 25, 1920 (*Sylloge*, n. 82).

[8] Canon 452, §1.

[9] Konings-Putzer: *Commentarium in facultates apostolicas*, edit. 5a (1898), p. 267.

[10] Instruction S.C.P.F., July 25, 1920 (*Sylloge*, n. 82, *ad* 4).

[11] *Ibid.*, *ad* 5.

previous occasions—as, for example, when there was question of the *missa pro populo* obligations.[12]

The prescriptions of Canon Law on diocesan consultors and the provisions for the government of the diocese *sede impedita* or *sede vacante* will be the same as in the United States.[13]

FRANCIS J. WINSLOW, M.M.

Maryknoll, N. Y.

[12] *Sylloge*, n. 151.

[13] *A.A.S.*, XXXVIII (1946), pp. 301 ff.

MEDITATION AND PRIESTLY LIFE

The advantages derived from spiritual reading and from meditation on heavenly things will be still more abundant if the priest tests himself as to how far his reading and meditation enter into his daily life. On this point St. Chrysostom's words are specially applicable to priests. Every night before going to sleep, "appeal to the judgment of your conscience; demand its account; examine, analyze the evil things of the day, and inflict some penance." The soundest advice and exhortations of most prudent spiritual directors prove how salutary this custom is, and how much it conduces to the practice of Christian virtue. For instance, St. Bernard teaches: "Sift thine own virtue diligently, by a daily examination of thy deeds. Observe carefully the advance made or count thy backslidings. . . . Seek to know thyself. . . . Set thy transgressions before thine eyes. Place thyself in thine own presence as if thou wert another, and then bewail thy misdeeds."

What a matter of regret it will be if those words of Our Lord should be fulfilled in you: "The children of this world are wiser . . .than the children of light." We know how carefully they look after their affairs, how they balance income and expenditures, auditing their accounts regularly and most accurately; they grieve over losses, and spare no effort in trying to recoup them. And we, if our minds are bent on attaining to honor, on acquiring property, or on gaining the glory of a public reputation for learning, behave with indifference and contempt in that most difficult and most important matter, the attainment of sanctity.

—Pope Pius X, in his letter, *Haerent animo*, Aug. 4, 1908.

THE THEOLOGICAL PROOF FOR THE NECESSITY OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

PART II

In his encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore*, dated Aug. 10, 1863, Pope Pius IX brought out one aspect of the Church's necessity which had not been stressed in the other pontifical documents to which we have referred. The other pronouncements were formulated in such a way as to show that the theological axiom "*extra ecclesiam nulla salus*" could not be explained by saying that the Church was merely the ordinary means of salvation, or that it was necessary only with the necessity of precept, or that some nebulous membership in or appurtenance to the "soul of the Church" was sufficient for salvation, or that it meant simply that the divine gifts in line with salvation belonged to and with the visible Church itself. The *Quanto conficiamur moerore* made it clear that the axiom could not be interpreted to mean that salvation is restricted to actual members of the Catholic Church. Furthermore it set forth authoritatively the truth that the desire to enter the Church, apart from which salvation is not achieved, need not be the explicit desire of the actual catechumen.

In taking up the teaching on the necessity of the Church, the *Quanto conficiamur moerore* begins with a perfectly clear and uncompromising condemnation of indifferentism, reminiscent of that which Pope Gregory XVI had written into his *Mirari vos arbitramur* more than thirty years before.[1] Like his predecessor, Pope Pius IX spoke out strongly against the error of indifferentism, the error which held that those who live by false teachings and are strangers to the true faith and to Catholic unity can attain to eternal life. The salvation which is not to be found outside the Catholic Church is presented here in the *Quanto conficiamur moerore* as the obtaining of this *vita aeterna*.

And here I must mention and reprove a most serious error into which some Catholics have fallen, imagining that men living in errors and

[1] The *Mirari vos arbitramur* condemned the teachings of Lamennais and others in the periodical *L'Avenir*. This encyclical's condemnation of indifferentism is found in Denzinger-Bannwart's *Enchiridion symbolorum* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1937), n. 1613. This work will be cited in the article as *DB*.

apart (*alienos*) from the true faith and from the Catholic unity can attain to eternal life. This, of course, is completely opposed to Catholic doctrine.[2]

The sentence which follows upon this passage in the encyclical is long and extremely complicated. It cannot be understood except in terms of the traditional theology of the Church.

It is known to us and to you that those who labor in invincible ignorance of our most holy religion, and who, carefully observing the natural law and its precepts which God has inscribed in the hearts of all, and being ready to obey God, live an honest and upright life can, through the working of the divine light and grace, attain eternal life, since God, who clearly sees, inspects, and knows the minds, the intentions, the thoughts and the habits of all, will, by reason of His supreme goodness and kindness, never allow anyone who has not the guilt of wilful sin to be punished by eternal sufferings.[3]

Now we would tragically misconstrue the meaning of this sentence if we were to interpret it as a kind of weakening of or an exception to the Catholic dogma that the Church itself is necessary for salvation. As a matter of fact, all that Pope Pius IX did in this sentence was to bring forward certain pertinent theological truths which had always been taught in the Catholic schools and which must be considered if we are to understand the teaching about the necessity of the Church. In so doing the great Pontiff brought out the fact that the Catholic teaching on this point had never meant and had never even appeared to mean that actual membership in the Church was requisite, with the necessity of means, for eternal salvation.

None of the official ecclesiastical documents which we have cited for their teaching on the necessity of the Church for salvation have mentioned actual *membership* in the Church. It is true of course that the text of these documents to which we have appealed does not in any case directly state or even imply by itself that membership is not necessary. If they were the only sources of information about the Church's teaching on this subject, then there might be some excuse for imagining that the authors of these documents were of the opinion that a man could not be saved without actually being a member of the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ. We really have at our disposition, however highly important dogmatic sources which show

[2] *DB*, 1677. [3] *Ibid.*

us very clearly that the Pontiffs and the Fathers who issued the documents with which we are concerned were fully aware of the fact that a man can be saved even though he is not a member of the Church although, in truth, no one is saved outside of that Church.

From the very beginnings of Christian history, the Church of God has been wont to reverence and honor as its own and as the glorious recipients of eternal salvation those martyrs who suffered death for the faith, even when these martyrs were not baptized. The Pontiffs and the conciliar Fathers who have given us our official teachings on the necessity of the Church for salvation were all fully aware of the truth St. Augustine set down in his *De civitate Dei*, that the eternal glory of a man who died for Christ before he could receive the baptismal initiation into the Church of God was far greater than that of the person who departs this life immediately after receiving the sacrament of baptism. St. Augustine had written that:

> Those who have been baptized when they no longer could escape death, and have departed this life with all their sins forgiven, have not so great merit as those who did not defer death, even though they were able to defer it, because they chose rather to end their life by professing Christ than to come to His baptism by denying Him.[4]

Furthermore, the men who formulated and expressed those statements about the necessity of the Church for salvation were cognizant of the fact that a person who died while intending to receive baptism, but before he had the opportunity actually to be baptized, could be saved by reason of that very desire. The constant teaching of the Church on this point is summed up by St. Ambrose in his *De obitu Valentiniani*.

> But I hear that you are sad because he [Valentinian II] did not receive the sacraments of baptism. Tell me, what else is there in us, apart from will, apart from petition? But for a long time, and even before he came into Italy, it was his desire that he should be initiated [into the Church by baptism]. Recently he made it known that he wished to be baptised by me and it was for this reason, rather than for any other causes, that he decided to summon me. Does he not have, therefore, the grace he has desired? Does he not have what he prayed for? Certainly he has received it because he prayed.[5]

---

[4] *De civitate Dei*, Lib. XIII, cap. 7. *CSEL*, XL, ii, 622; *MPL*, XLI, 381.

[5] *De obitu Valentiniani*, n. 51. *MPL*, XVI, 1374.

Thus, when the *ecclesia docens* has taught that the true and visible Church of Jesus Christ is so constituted that outside of it "no one at all can be saved," it has obviously understood that men like the martyrs of whom St. Augustine spoke, and like the catechumen about whom St. Ambrose spoke, were, like the actual *fideles* or members of the Church, not "outside" it. When the Popes and the Bishops who pronounced the various dogmatic formulae dealing with the Church's necessity used the expression "outside the Church," they obviously meant to imply that the unbaptized martyr and the catechumen dying in the state of grace were, with reference to this point at least, "inside the Church," together with all the Catholics or *fideles* who are joined to Our Lord by the outward bonds of ecclesiastical unity.

The doctrine that a man can be "inside the Church," in the sense of being in a position to receive eternal salvation, while he is not actually a member of that Church, which is a visible and highly organized society, is obviously something quite difficult to teach accurately and adequately. Yet this doctrine is nothing more or less than the truth manifestly revealed by God to His Church. Many a scholastic theologian has tried his hand at what seemed at the time to be a workable and pedagogically apt formula for explaining the catechumen's status "inside the Church." Alphonsus a Castro and Francis Suarez simply cut the Gordian knot and taught that the catechumen should be considered as a member of the Church.[6] Both appealed to well known papal decisions. In one of these rescripts Pope Innocent II taught that a local Church could and ought to offer its prayers and Masses for a man who had lived and died as a holy presbyter of that Church but who, it developed after his death, had never been validly baptized.[7] In the other, Pope Innocent III dealt with the case of a Jew who wished to enter the Church but who could find no one to baptize him when he was at the point of death. This man had immersed himself in water and had pronounced the baptismal formula for himself. The Holy Father informed the Bishop of Metz that if the man were still living, he

[6] Cf. Alphonsus a Castro, in the *De iusta haereticorum punitione*, Lib. I, cap. 8, in the *Opera Alphonsi a Castro* (Paris, 1571), col. 1096 f. and Suarez, in the *Tractatus de fide*, Disp. IX, sectio 1, in the *Opus de triplici virtute theologica* (Lyons, 1621), p. 160.

[7] Cf. *DB*, 388.

ought to be properly baptized, since the act he had performed was invalid. If, on the other hand, the man were already dead, the Bishop and his flock could be certain that he had gone to heaven "*propter sacramenti fidem, etsi non propter fidei sacramentum.*"[8]

Despite the manifest brilliance of these theologians, the theory of Alphonsus a Castro and of Francis Suarez never achieved any real success in the field of Catholic theology. The evidence that catechumens were not actually members or parts of the visible Church militant was far too strong. Today, of course, their position is entirely untenable. John Lens and Francis Sylvius, however, essayed another and a less radical simplification.[9] Both of these distinguished writers taught that the baptism of water is only the ordinary means for entrance into the Church militant (quite a different position, it must be remarked, from that which pretends that the Church itself is only the ordinary means of salvation), and held that a catechumen in the state of grace is invisibly integrated into the visible Church prior to his death, if he should die without having the opportunity to receive the sacrament of baptism. There was something fantastic about this explanation, and it never attracted any important number of adherents in the theological world.

What seems to have been the best explanation of all was offered by John Wiggers, like Lens a member of the faculty of sacred theology in the University of Louvain. According to Wiggers:

> No one can be saved outside of the Church, that is, without being in it either acually and in reality or by desire and intent (*desiderio et affectu*). For when any person, in the light of the true faith, is converted to God with all his heart and wishes to be incorporated into the Church, in such way that it is not his fault that he is not externally and really incorporated into it, then he can be saved by reason of that desire (*mediante illo voto*). In the same way, under similar circumstances, he can be saved by the intention of baptism. In like manner a

---

[8] Cf. *DB*, 413.

[9] Cf. Sylvius, in the work entitled *Libri sex de praecipuis fidei nostrae controversiis cum nostris haereticis*, Lib. III, qu. 1, art. 3, in the *Opera Francisci Sylvii* (Antwerp, 1698), V, 238. John Lens, a Louvain theologian, who died in 1593, is the only authority cited by Sylvius in support of his theory. I have not been able to find a copy of Lens' *De una Christi in terris Ecclesia libri sex* (Louvain, 1588).

man could be saved from shipwreck even if he did not actually go aboard another and an undamaged craft so as to be within it. But if he holds on to it with his hands, he will be brought with it to the shore and safety. These desires and wishes are like hands, which people of this sort use to grasp and to hold on to the ship which is the Church, although they never enter it absolutely, really, and in a bodily manner.[10]

Now it is important to note that the encyclical *Quanto conficiamur moerore* not only takes it for granted that a person who is not a member of the Church can be saved, but also teaches that salvation is possible even for one who is (and who presumably remains) in invincible ignorance of this Church. According to this document, the people who observe the precepts of the natural law, and who are prepared to obey God, and who lead an honest and upright life can attain eternal life through the working of the divine light and of the divine grace, even while they remain in invincible ignorance of the true Church of Jesus Christ. Yet this teaching is by no means a novelty in the Catholic doctrine and in the Catholic Church. It is manifestly implied in the teaching of the Council of Trent on justification and the preparation for justification in adults.

After explaining, in the fifth chapter of its *Decretum de justificatione* that the reception of sanctifying grace by an adult who has hitherto been in a state of sin or aversion from God involves the work of grace and our own real co-operation, the Council, in the subsequent chapter, goes on to explain the acts by which adults are disposed to receive the supernatural life from God.

Now they are disposed to justice itself when, aroused and aided by divine grace, receiving faith from hearing, they are freely moved towards God, believing those things to be true which have been divinely revealed and promised, and especially that the sinner has been justified by God through His grace and through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus; and when, understanding themselves to be sinners, they, by turning themselves from the fear of divine justice, by which they are beneficially terrified, to consider God's mercy, they are raised up to hope, trusting that God will be kind to them for the sake of Christ. And then they begin to love Him as the font of all justice, and therefore they are moved against sin by a certain hatred and detestation, that is, by the sort of penance which should be performed before

[10] John Wiggers, in his *Commentaria de virtutibus theologicis* (Louvain, 1689), p. 109.

baptism. And finally [they are disposed to justice] when they propose to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep the divine commandments.[11]

Thus, according to the Council of Trent, there are six distinct steps which enter into the preparation for the reception of the life of sanctifying grace, or, in other words, for the forgiveness of sin. According to Pope Boniface VIII, in his *Unam sanctam*, the Church is requisite for the forgiveness of sin, or for *justificatio*, in the same way that it is necessary for eternal salvation.[12] Hence, from the consideration of these six factors of the disposition for justification, we can see the kind of knowledge of the Church which is requisite for the reception of grace and for salvation itself.

The six factors are, (1) faith, (2) salutary fear of God's justice, (3) hope, (4) *amor initialis*, (5) penance, and (6) the proposal to receive baptism, to begin a new life, and to keep God's commandments. Obviously the key to the understanding of our problem is faith itself. From the Catholic teaching about what explicit belief a man must have in order to be saved, we can see the perennial Catholic truth that a man may be in a certain measure inside the Church and may be saved without having any explicit knowledge of the Church as such.

Now the faith by which men are saved, the faith which necessarily enters into the preparation for justification on the part of an adult, is proposed by the Council of Trent as *fides ex auditu*. It involves the acceptance of the message actually revealed by God Himself. Thus a mere expression of willingness to believe what God has revealed if He has really given any message to the human race would not constitute the requisite faith. This faith is the actual and unquestioning acceptance of the doctrine which we know as the divine public revelation.

There has always been, however, some question as to the amount of this divine public revelation which a man must believe explicitly in order to be saved, or in order to receive the life of sanctifying grace. It is absolutely certain that there is no possibility of salvation for an adult unless he believes explicitly at least the two truths that God exists and that He rewards those who seek Him. Furthermore it is also certain that this salutary belief must consider God as the Author of the super-

[11] Sessio VI, cap. 6. *DB*, 798.

[12] Cf. *DB*, 468.

natural order, that is, as giving His creatures a reward or remuneration far greater than their status as creatures would demand. What has divided the theologians over the centuries has been the question about the need of explicit belief in other propositions of faith for eternal salvation.

As far as the actual documentation of the Church is concerned, it would seem that explicit belief in the redemptive work of Christ is required. In the chapter of the *Decretum de justificatione* from which we have just cited, the Council of Trent speaks of the adult preparing himself for justification as "believing those things to be true which have been divinely revealed and promised, and especially that the sinner has been justified by God through His grace and through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus."[13] It is certainly difficult to interpret this statement as other than an indication that the Council was convinced that there would be no justification apart from explicit belief in these truths.

Nevertheless, there have been divergent teachings on this point in Catholic theological literature. Thus Billuart teaches that since the gospel has been sufficiently promulgated, explicit belief in both the Trinity and the Incarnation must be considered as necessary for all, with the necessity of means, for eternal salvation. Billuart regards the time when the gospel of Christ could be said to have been sufficiently promulgated as something about which we have no certain information. He hazards the opinion, however, that the gospel could be said to have been sufficiently promulgated about forty years after Our Lord's ascension into heaven.[14]

Melchior Cano offers an interesting variation of this opinion. He holds that explicit faith in Christ is necessary for eternal and final salvation, while an implicit faith suffices for the remission of sins and thus for justification.[15] Suarez and the Salmanticenses, were of the opinion that, since the promulgation of the gospel, an explicit faith in Christ is *per se* a necessary means for salvation, but that, as a matter of fact, some people are saved apart from this means *per accidens*. This opinion, for all practical purposes,

[13] Sessio VI, cap. 6. *DB*, 798.

[14] Cf. Billuart's *Tractatus de fide*, Dissertatio III, art. 2, in the *Cursus theologiae* (Paris: Lecoffre, 1904), V, 29 f.

[15] Cf. Cano's *Relectio de sacramentis in genere*, Pars II, conclusio 3, in the *Melchioris Cani opera theologica* (Rome: Filiziani, 1900), III, 230 ff.

is equivalent to the teaching of Blasio Beraza in our own times. Beraza holds that explicit faith in Our Lord as a mediator is not absolutely requisite for salvation even in New Testament times.[16]

These are highly interesting opinions, and they serve to throw light on the problem of the Church's necessity for salvation in so far as they show that no theologian demands as absolutely requisite for eternal salvation any explicit belief in the Catholic Church itself. Hence it is obvious that the very *schola theologorum* which has insisted most strongly upon the validity of the doctrine that the Church is requisite for salvation never intended to teach and cannot legitimately be interpreted as teaching that a man had to be an actual member of the Church, or, absolutely speaking, even had to possess explicit knowledge of the Church as God's kingdom on earth in order to attain eternal salvation. The men who expounded the Church's teaching about its own necessity have always explained that teaching against the background of a theology which states that a man can be saved by a desire of the Church even when that desire was merely implicit.

Thus, even from this point of view, it would be absurd to qualify the teaching of the *Quanto conficiamur moerore*, telling of the possibility of salvation for a man who lives in invincible ignorance of the Church, as in any way an attenuation or a partial abandonment of the dogma on the Church's real and absolute necessity for salvation. The statement we have seen was nothing more or less than an official pronouncement of a doctrine which had long been taught as an integral part of the same science of sacred theology in which the teaching on the Church's necessity is expounded and developed. It forms one of the many truths which must be taken into consideration when we study and teach that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church.

There is, however, still another aspect to this statement in the *Quanto conficiamur moerore* to which the theologian must advert if he is to formulate the teaching on the necessity of the Church accurately and adequately. The encyclical of Pope Pius IX speaks of the possibility of salvation for those who *sedulously* (the Latin "*sedulo*" conveys the idea of continued action) obey the natural law and who live an honest life. It speaks of this possi-

[16] Cf. Beraza's *Tractatus de virtutibus infusis* (Bilbao: El Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, 1929), pp. 448 ff.

bility as available to such people "through the working of the divine light and grace."

Now a person "sedulously" observing the natural law is manifestly one who is living for a long time without committing a mortal sin. It is, however, the common teaching of Catholic theology that, in the status of fallen nature, no one can remain for any considerable time without committing mortal sin apart from the aid of supernatural grace.[17] Furthermore, it is most probable that the grace, apart from which a man will not actually observe all the natural precepts taken collectively over any considerable period of time, is sanctifying grace itself.[18]

Thus, far from implying that a man can merit eternal salvation by purely natural acts, performed outside of the Catholic Church, the encyclical letter of Pope Pius IX really teaches that the man who observes all the natural law can attain eternal salvation through that life of grace which he already possesses. And, if he has the life of grace, he has already gone through that process by which he was disposed to or prepared for justification, which, according to the Council of Trent is "not only the remission of sins, but also the sanctification and renovation of the inward man through the voluntary reception of grace and the gifts, whence man is changed from an unjust person into a just person and from an enemy into a friend, in order that he may be an heir according to the hope of life eternal."[19]

In other words, the man who is sedulously observing the natural law in such a way as to avoid mortal sin for a considerable period of time is one who has already made an explicit act of supernatural faith, in which the belief in the Church was at least implicitly contained. With this faith, and with the real hope in God which followed upon it, he made his act of love for God, the act of the theological virtue of charity, inseparable from the life of sanctifying grace in adults. In this act of charity, the man who sedulously observes the natural law formulates the real intention to do whatever God has commanded, and to associate himself with God, even in this life. The association or fellowship with

[17] Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica*, Ia-IIae, qu. 109, art. 8.

[18] Cf. the Salmanticenses, *Tractatus de gratia Dei*, Disputatio II, dubium, 6, in their *Cursus theologicus* (Paris and Brussels, 1878), IX, 249 ff, and Billot, *De gratia Christi* (Rome: The Gregorian University, 1928), pp. 70 ff.

[19] Sessio VI, cap. 7. *DB*, 799.

God in this world demanded by Christ as a necessary means to salvation is the reality or communion which we know as the visible Catholic Church. Hence, by and in his act of theological charity, the man who has avoided mortal sin for a long time has already desired to enter the Catholic Church, even though he is not explicitly aware of the actual existence or status of that Church.

This, then, is one aspect of the meaning of the dogma on the Church's necessity for eternal salvation. Even a person who is invincibly ignorant of the true Church can, through an act of explicit faith in God as the head of the supernatural order, and through an act of charity for God known in this supernatural way, be in the state of sanctifying grace and friendship for God which is the beginning of eternal life in this world. Such a person, through his supernatural faith and charity, implicitly but sincerely wills to be within the community of fellowship with God and Christ. This community of fellowship, in the merciful designs of God's providence, is the visible Catholic Church, the visible Church of the Roman communion.

Such is the lesson brought home in the subsequent sentence of the *Quanto conficiamur moerore.*

> But it is a perfectly well known Catholic dogma that no one can be saved outside of the Catholic Church, and that those who are contumacious against the authority of that same Church, and who are pertinaciously divided from the unity of that Church and from Peter's successor, the Roman Pontiff, to whom the custody of the vineyard has been committed by the Savior, cannot obtain eternal salvation.[20]

In this lesson two distinct truths are enuntiated. In the first place the encyclical assures us absolutely that no one can be saved outside the Church. The second tells us that no one of those who remain separated from the Church through their own fault are in a position to attain eternal life as long as they remain in that status. It is tremendously important, however, to realize that the first statement is in no way restricted to the extent of the second. The first informs us absolutely that no one can be saved outside the Church. The second tells us that those who pertinaciously remain separated from the unity and from the leadership of the Church in this world are most certainly in the

[20] *DB*, 1677.

category of those "outside the Church," and have placed themselves in a position such that, while they remain in this status, they cannot attain eternal life. Thus it would be an obvious misinterpretation of the encyclical's teaching to imagine that it meant to say that no person could be judged "outside the Church" except those who pertinaciously and thus voluntarily refuse to enter its communion even after they are aware of the validity of its claims. Actually any human being who is not really a member of the Church and who has not at least an implicit real desire to dwell within it is "outside the Church," and is thus one of those in whose favor the missionary charity of Catholics must be exercised.

We must not lose sight of this fact. Separation from the Church always is *objectively* an evil, even in the case where the person in this status is not blameworthy in the sight of God precisely for being "outside the Church." The man who is "outside the Church," in the sense in which this expression is employed in the dogmatic formulae about the Church's necessity for salvation, is definitely turned away from God, his ultimate end, by original sin, or by mortal sin, or by both. No one, however, is guilty in the sight of God precisely by reason of his separation from the Church except those who remain outside of it pertinaciously, knowing that God wills that they should enter it.

Hence it would be quite erroneous to interpret the teaching of the *Quanto conficiamur moerore* to mean that all of those who are outside the Church and thus in need of Catholic missionary charity have sinned against God in not coming in to the Church. It is quite possible to be "outside the Church," without, to use Newman's old phrase, "having sinned against the light."

Actually, according to the divine constitution of the Church itself, the responsibility for bringing those outside the fold into the company of Christ rests, not upon the outsiders, but upon the Church itself. Broadly speaking, the Church is not simply a goal towards which the people of the world are supposed to run of their own accord. It is the living society of the disciples, commissioned and commanded to bring itself and its message to the children of men. If contact is not made with those outside the fold, the fault lies, not with these people, but with the Catholics who have been recreant to their missionary vocation.

This, after all, is the final conclusion of the *Quanto conficiamur moerore.*

> God forbid that the children of the Catholic Church should ever in any way be the enemies of those who are in no way joined to us in the same bonds of faith and of charity. But let them [the Catholics] rather strive always to attend these people when they [the non-Catholics] are poor or sick or afflicted with any other ills, and help them by all the services of Christian charity. Primarily, let them strive to take them out of the darkness of error in which they unfortunately live and bring them back to Catholic truth and to the loving Mother Church which never ceases to hold out its maternal hands to them affectionately and to call them back to its embrace in order that, founded and strengthened in faith, hope, and charity, and bringing forth fruit in every good work, they may attain eternal salvation.[21]

In the final analysis, the teaching on the necessity of the Catholic Church thus appears as the dominant motive force in the charity of Catholic missionary endeavor. The Church itself, the society or community within which alone in this world the fellowship of God and Christ is to be found, is absolutely necessary for salvation with the necessity of means. According to the divine revelation, infallibly proposed in the dogma of the Church, both the members of this society and those who sincerely, even though only implicitly, desire to live within it, are "inside the Church" in such a way as to be able to live the life of sanctifying grace which is the beginning of eternal salvation.

All of those who are not members of the Church, however, whether they desire to enter it or not, stand in real need of this society. If they long to be in God's household on this earth, they actually will to live as members of this visible society. If they do not, and consequently they are unfortunately averted from God and deprived of the supernatural life Christ died to procure for them, they ought to have the benefit of the Church, through which they may be brought to life everlasting.

The fact of the matter is, as Pope Pius IX pointed out so effectively, that the responsibility for bringing this needed benefit to the persons for whom Christ died on the Cross devolves directly upon the members of the Catholic Church. Primarily, of course, it is the duty of the Catholic hierarchy, of the apostolic college as it now exists in the company of Christ. We should not forget, in

[21] *DB*, 1678.

this instance, the terrifying words of St. John Chrysostom with reference to the responsibility of the individual Catholic bishop.

> To pass over everything else: if one soul depart unbaptized, does not this subvert all his own prospect of salvation? The loss of one soul carries with it a penalty which no language can represent. For if the salvation of that soul was of such value that the Son of God became man and suffered so much, think how terrible a punishment the losing of it must bring.[22]

In this passage St. John Chrysostom speaks directly of the Bishops of the Catholic Church. The primary responsibility for the work of bringing the means of salvation to those souls for whom Our Lord died devolves upon them. They constitute the apostolic college, the band of men commissioned by Our Lord to carry His message and His Church to those for whom He offered the sacrifice of Calvary. Hence it is primarily their business and their obligation, as a group gathered under the presidency of Peter, to expend every effort and to utilize every resource at their command to bring the means of salvation to those who are not members of the true Church.

We must not forget, however, that the obligation to work effectively and sincerely to bring non-Catholics into the Church is in no way limited to the apostolic college. It is true that this obligation devolves upon them primarily. Yet it is an obligation to a work in which the Catholic people themselves are bound to co-operate. All the doctrine of Catholic Action constitutes a warning to the people of the Church that they are expected to aid their hierarchy in the apostolic work and that they are recreant to their Christian vocation if they fail to enter into this activity.

Thus, in the last analysis, the teaching on the necessity of the Catholic Church for salvation does not seek to blame non-Catholics as a group for failing to enter the Church. It is inclined, on the other hand, to militate against what might be a certain complacency on the part of the Catholics themselves. It insists upon the obligation which God has laid upon the members of His Church to do all in their power to bring the necessary means of salvation to the souls for whom Our Lord died. Its practical effect must be, not to irritate and insult those who are unfortu-

[22] *In Actus Apostolorum homilia tertia*, n. 4. *MPG*, LX, 40.

nate enough to be non-members of Our Lord's Church, but to stimulate the members of that Church to expend every effort to bring the fellowship of Christ in God's kingdom on earth to people who need it so badly, and who are so unfavorably placed with reference to eternal salvation by the fact that they are not members of the Church.

This, the essential and manifestly charitable practical attitude of the Catholic Church towards those who are not its members, is brought out most effectively in the present Holy Father's encyclical, the *Mystici Corporis*.

> Most affectionately we invite all of them individually that, yielding of their own accord and freely to the inner impulses of divine grace, they should take care to remove themselves from that status in which they cannot be secure about their own eternal salvation, seeing that even though they may be disposed towards the Mystical Body of the Redeemer by a certain kind of desire and longing (*desiderio ac voto*) which they do not understand, they still lack so many and such great heavenly favors and helps which they may enjoy only in the Catholic Church. May they all therefore enter the Catholic unity and, joined with us in the one structure of the Body of Jesus Christ, may they come together unto the Head in the society of the most glorious love. With never ceasing prayers to the Spirit of love and truth, with hands upraised and outstretched, we await their coming, not to the house of a stranger, but to the house which is their own and their Father's.[23]

It is important for us to realize that, when we speak of the theological proof for the proposition that the Catholic Church is necessary for eternal salvation with the necessity of means, the proposition must be understood as expressing all of this truth brought out in the various official pronouncements of the *ecclesia docens*. The Church as a society, as a thing, is presented to us in the divine public revelation as a necessary means for salvation. Those who are fortunate enough to have the grace of membership in this Church have satisfied this one of the conditions for salvation in an unmistakable way. Non-members of the Church may possibly be "inside the Church" as the community of fellowship with God by reason of a real, though perhaps only an implicit, desire to live within it. Their status, however, is distinctly unfavorable and unfortunate from the spiritual point of view. Thus

[23] *AAS*, XXXV, 7 (July, 1943), 243.

it is the business of the Church, which as a society is animated and motivated by the charity of Christ Himself, to bring this means of salvation certainly and effective to all of those for whom Our Lord offered the sacrifice of His life.

The theological proof of this teaching must be based upon the consideration of the revealed teaching about salvation, and on the concept of the Church itself as God's kingdom on earth.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE CHURCH'S DIVINE MANDATE

The universal divine mandate with which the Church of Jesus Christ has been by Jesus Christ Himself incommunicably and absolutely commissioned concerns itself with eternity, with heaven and the supernatural—with that order of things which, on one side, it is of the strictest obligation for every rational creature to consider and to which, on the other side, it is necessary by the very nature of things to coordinate the remainder.

The Church of Jesus Christ is certainly acting within the limits of its mandate, not only when it puts into souls the first indispensable beginnings and elements of supernatural life, but also when it assists and encourages the growth of this supernatural life according to the opportunities and the capacities of persons and in the ways and by the means which, in the Church's judgment seem suitable also, with the purpose of preparing capable and efficient collaborators with the apostolic Hierarchy and clergy. It is Jesus Christ Himself who made the solemn declaration that He came precisely that souls might have not only some beginning or some element of supernatural life, but that they might have it in greater abundance. "I am come that they may have life, and have it more abundantly."

—Pope Pius XI, in his encyclical *Non abbiamo bisogno,* issued June 29, 1931.

Answers to Questions

ASSOCIATION WITH DIVORCED PERSONS

Question: What should be the practice of Catholics in the matter of association with persons who have been divorced and have attempted another marriage? Nowadays, it is not unusual for Catholics, especially those who are well-to-do and move in more "exclusive" circles, to associate as freely with such persons as with those who are properly married. Some Catholics do not hesitate to attend the remarriage of a divorced friend in the presence of a civil magistrate or a non-Catholic clergyman. Catholic parents are sometimes faced with the problem as to whether they may or should attend the marriage of their daughter to a divorced man outside the Church. What norms can be proposed to Catholics to guide them in situations of this kind?

Answer: The questioner has brought up one of the most difficult problems in modern American life. Persons who have been divorced and "remarried" are now numbered by the hundreds of thousands in our country. They are found in all classes of society; they represent all religious denominations, including even some who call themselves Catholics. Association with such persons cannot be entirely avoided. They live in the same apartment houses as Catholics, they are found among the tradespeople and professional men and public officials with whom the faithful transact business, they are their fellow workers in shop and office, they are their employers or their employees. To avoid all contact with such unfortunate persons nowadays we should have to bury ourselves in a desert.

The chief moral problem centred about association with those who have attempted remarriage after divorce (whom we shall call simply "divorced persons" hereafter) is the scandal which such association may cause. The scandal consists principally in the fact that by freely associating with such persons Catholics are likely to give the impression that they regard the conjugal life of the couples in question as perfectly lawful, or as only slightly culpable. Other persons who are contemplating divorce may in consequence be more inclined toward severing their marriage tie. The couple themselves may be encouraged in their efforts to per-

suade themselves that their union is a genuine marriage. Those who are not well instructed in Catholic doctrine may be led to believe that the Catholic Church is mitigating its teaching on divorce, and that it will be only a matter of time before the Church will fully conform to the standards of the modern world.

It would be impossible to lay down rules for the guidance of Catholics that would adequately cover every possible case. But the following general norms, we believe, will be helpful:

(1) Purely business relations with divorced persons are ordinarily permissible. To trade in a store whose owner is a divorced man, to consult a lawyer or a doctor enmeshed in a similar marital entanglement, to attend a ball game when several of the players are divorced men—such activities would be allowed to Catholics, even though only their own personal utility or convenience or pleasure is thereby promoted. Under this heading would come those meetings which appear to be of a social nature, though actually business is involved, such as the visit of the junior member of a firm, aspiring to advancement, to the home of the senior member who happens to be divorced. Similarly, to attend a motion picture whose star actor has been divorced and remarried three times would not be forbidden, provided the picture is not itself objectionable. In saying that these things are permissible we do not intend to deny that it would be more commendable in some instances for Catholics to abstain even from such associations with those whose marital status is opposed to God's law. For example, it might be a healthy move if Catholics banded together to boycott motion pictures which feature actors and actresses who flaunt even the fundamental canons of decency in their private lives.

(2) Purely social relations with a couple, one (or each) of whom is known to have a previous spouse still living should be avoided by Catholics or at least reduced to the minimum. When Catholics are as friendly with such couples as they are with decent people, properly married, they manifest little regard for the attitude of their Church towards those who so gravely violate the divine law. For the Church declares such persons *ipso facto* infamous (Can. 2356). And it is difficult to excuse Catholics from the grave sin of scandal if they frequently attend parties and dinners at the homes of such persons, or perhaps even spend a few days with them from time to time, and reciprocate by an invitation

to their own home. The strange fact is that these same Catholics would emphatically decline an invitation to a social function in a household of which the master is openly living in concubinage, without having had any marriage ceremony. Yet, according to Catholic belief, the man who has divorced his lawful wife and attempted remarriage is actually in the same situation. The mere fact that he and his partner went through the marriage service before a minister or a justice of the peace does not alter the fact that, as the Catholic Church views the matter, they are living openly in adulterous union. Why then, should not Catholics realize the incongruity of giving this couple the same respect and courtesy that are given to a man and woman living in honorable wedlock? At most, a very rare exchange of visits might be permitted, when some special occasion calls for it. But when Catholics associate frequently and regularly with divorced persons for merely social reasons, I would consider them guilty objectively of grave sin; if they do so only occasionally without any justifying reason, it would seem to be a venial sin. The case is not changed substantially by the fact that the couple are non-Catholics and are apparently convinced that their marriage is valid; though, of course, when they are Catholics the danger of giving scandal by association with them is greater.

More leniency could be exercised when the association involves only one of the parties—for example, when a group of men invite a divorced fellow-worker to accompany them on a fishing party. Again, Catholics would not be guilty of scandal if they attended a social function in the home of a friend to which a divorced person and his present partner were also invited. But this should not happen very frequently. In other words, Catholics should not become regular members of a social group in which divorced persons are fully acceptable.

(3) Apart from most unusual circumstances, a Catholic would not be permitted to be present at the attempted remarriage of a divorced person (nor, *a fortiori*, to act as bridesmaid, best man, etc.), knowing full well that such a union is invalid in the sight of God. Such attendance would ordinarily be gravely scandalous. Speaking of an analogous case, the attempted marriage of a Catholic before a non-Catholic minister, Davis says: "Assistance at a mixed marriage in a Protestant church would not be tolerated, since this would be co-operation in violating a serious church

law that forbids mixed marriages without dispensation, and such a marriage would now be invalid" (*Moral and Pastoral Theology* [New York, 1938], I, 286).

Parents or near relatives of a Catholic involved in such an unfortunate union might argue that by attending the "marriage" they can retain the good will of the erring one and thus have a better chance of later inducing him to turn away from the sinful cohabitation. But, even if there is such a probability, it would not seem a sufficient reason to outweigh the grave scandal that would almost certainly ensue. Moreover, there would usually be just as much probability that a severe attitude on the part of the parents or relatives will open the eyes of the misguided Catholic.

After a marriage of this kind has occurred the parents may—and even should—show the sinner that their love and sympathy are bestowed on him in full measure, but that they are unchanged in their condemnation of his evil conduct. It would be permissible to invite him to visit them; but visits from the couple together should be definitely disapproved, or at most allowed only rarely. On the occasion of a large gathering—for example, when the parents are celebrating their golden wedding anniversary or when a son of the family is offering his first Mass—a difficult problem is presented, but I believe that Catholic principles require in such an event that the couple should not be invited. At most, the one who is a member of the family could be asked to come.

Perhaps to some Catholics these norms may appear too strict. It must be admitted that they are not in accord with the customs of the day, which regard the marriage bond so lightly. But, in view of the scandal that is undoubtedly caused by the apparent recognition of a union that is a grave violation of God's law, it seems that priests should guide the faithful according to the principles that have here been set down. There are times when pastoral prudence will suggest that individuals be left in good faith; but that does not justify priests in failing to give general instructions concerning a problem which occurs so frequently and which so vitally affects the sacredness of the sacrament of Matrimony.

A MORAL PROBLEM FOR EMBALMERS

Question: In view of the ecclesiastical law that all the portions of the human body are to be buried, what is to be said of the

custom which undertakers generally follow of pouring down the toilet the blood which they draw from a corpse in preparation for the embalming process?

Answer: Undoubtedly the exact observance of Church law would require that the blood drawn from the dead bodies of the faithful be buried, just as amputated limbs must be interred, according to a ruling given by the Holy Office, Aug. 3, 1897 (Cf. *Fontes*, n. 1189; IV, 494). Ruland-Rattler make this observation: "People should guard against abuses in the disposal of the blood, which some undertakers simply pour into the toilet. The bottle containing the dead person's blood can easily be deposited in the tomb together with the coffin." (*Pastoral Medicine* [St. Louis, 1936], p. 208).

As far as pastoral practice is concerned, the priest should bring this point to the attention of the Catholic undertakers in his parish, if he judges that they would be induced to adopt the practice just suggested or some equally reverential mode of disposing of the blood in accord with Church legislation. It is possible, however, that a priest will foresee that objections will be raised by the undertakers—perhaps on the grounds that it might seem gruesome to the members of the family to have the blood of the deceased retained, or perhaps on the score that sanitary regulations might render such a procedure difficult. If such objections are anticipated, the priest could refrain from bringing up the matter; for in that event there would be sufficient reason for tolerating the existing practice. In any case, the disposal of the blood in the manner usually employed would not seem to be a grave violation of the ecclesiastical ruling.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

CLOTH OF GOLD *VERSUS* "OLD GOLD"

Question: One rather often sees vestments, not of gold cloth, but of silk or damask of the color known as "old gold." Is it correct to use such material for liturgical vestments?

Answer: The colors of the vestments, whether for celebrant or ministers, as well as for such furnishings of the altar as the antependium and the veil for the tabernacle, are prescribed by the rubrics of the Missal (*Rub. Gen.*, XVIII, 1) as limited to five: white, red, green, violet, and black. A decree of the Congregation

of Rites (No. 4084, 3) gives the option of substituting rose color for violet on *Gaudete* and *Laetare* Sundays. Yellow and blue are expressly forbidden by legislation of the Sacred Congregation (cf. decrees 2704, 4, and 3779, 3). "Old gold" is a variant of yellow and so falls under the condemnation. However, real coth of gold, woven with gold threads, is permitted as a substitute for white, green, and red, but not for violet or black. A material, "old gold" merely in color, with no threads of gold interwoven, is not cloth of gold and hence not a permissible fabric, because incorrect in color, for vestments or antependia or tabernacle veils. The gold cloth received the affirmative vote of the Sacred Congregation in the decree No. 3191, 4. A subsequent decision (No. 3646, 3) permits cloth of silver as a substitute for white. We are speaking here of the general legislation of the Church and not of concessions *per modum gratiae*, like the privilege in some countries of using blue on the feast and during the octave of the Immaculate Conception of Our Lady.

ABSOLUTION AT THE GRAVE

Question: In giving the final absolution of the body at the grave, I have frequently been told to stand at the head of the casket. Should not one stand at the foot of the body just as he does at the absolution which is conducted in the church?

Answer: The Ritual (Tit. VI, Cap. iii, 7) directs that for the absolution of the body, following the funeral Mass, the celebrant and his attendants take position at the foot of the body opposite the subdeacon with the processional cross, who stands flanked by the acolytes at the head of the coffin. There is no indication in the Ritual that this dispostion of officiant and ministers is changed when they go to cemetery for the final part of the absolution. So ceremonial writers direct that the same order as to position be observed at the grave as in the church (cf. Fortescue, p. 451; Wapelhorst, p. 410).

CORRECT RINGING OF THE *ANGELUS*

Question: What is the prescribed order to be observed in ringing the bell for the *Angelus?* Is this correct: three strokes with pauses between each one and then nine without intervals?

Answer: We can find no official prescriptions concerning the

method of ringing the *Angelus*. The customary procedure is that described by our correspondent, or some close variant of it, as three triple strokes sounded three times with pauses between, then usually nine unspaced strokes or a series pealed rapidly. The Roman custom is a distinctive one: thirteen strokes divided as follows: a group of three, then one of four, another of five, and a final single stroke.

ONLY ONE PROCESSIONAL CROSS

Question: We have a large number of sanctuary boys. When they go in procession to the altar for High Mass, we have a cross-bearer without acolytes go at the head of the procession. A second cross-bearer, attended by the acolytes with lighted candles, walks just before the master of ceremonies and the celebrant with the deacon and subdeacon. It has been said that it is incorrect to have two cross-bearers, no matter how long the procession. Is this correct?

Answer: Generally speaking, there should be only one cross-bearer in a procession, whatever its length. This crucifer, whether a subdeacon in vestments, as in the processions of Holy Thursday and Good Friday, or a cleric in surplice, walks at the head of the procession and is accompanied by the acolytes with their lighted candles. This is the provision of the Ritual (Tit. IX, *De processionibus*). The Congregation of Sacred Rites (No. 3144, 3) has decided that the entire body of the diocesan clergy, and hence *a fortiori* of altar boys, should march behind only one processional cross. Confraternities, however, and members of religious orders or congregations, participating in a procession in their distinctive dress, may have for each organization a separate cross (cf. Wapelhorst, p. 419; Fortescue, p. 378).

THE *ALLELUIA EXTRA TEMPUS PASCHALE*

In answer to a query concerning the *Alleluia* added to the responsories of Tierce, Sext, and None on the feast and during the octave of Corpus Christi, we pointed out (*AER*, CXVIII, 1 [Jan. 1948]. 59) that the *Alleluia* was added to these because they directly referred to the feast, while it was omitted in the responsories of Prime and Compline which are common to all days of the year. In an excess of generalization, we ventured the re-

mark that Corpus Christi was the only feast, *extra tempus Paschale*, which employs this supplementary *Alleluia*, which is otherwise distinctive of the Easter season. Confusion naturally came the very month of the publication of this response, when we found the *Alleluia* punctuating the responsories of Tierce, Sext, and None on the feast of the Epiphany and remembered other instances in which *Alleluia* was added to antiphons outside of Paschaltide. While the *Alleluia* is distinctively the consecrated expression of the joy of the Church in the resurrection of Our Lord and hence particularly proper to the Easter season, we were too hurried in writing the general statement that the multiplied *Alleluia* of Corpus Christi was the only instance of its use in responsories *extra tempus Paschale*. All of which emphasizes our conviction that celerity is often the foe of accuracy.

BLESS-ED *VERSUS* BLEST AGAIN

While we have no intention of conducting in these columns a palestra of orthoepy, a subscriber asks us to add the following contribution to the discussion of the moot question of the proper pronunciation of the word "Blessed." He cites Fowler's *Modern English Usage* (p. 53), where he found: "The attributive adjective is regularly dissyllabic, 'bless-ed innocence,' 'every bless-ed night.' The past tense, past participle, and predicative adjective are regularly monosyllabic: 'He is blessed (blest) with good health,' 'Blessed (blest) if I know.' "

For our own poor part, we have been saying "Bless-ed be God" for decades and we are *blest* if we are going to change now.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

The efforts which are being made by the dense ranks of our enemies to destroy Christ's Kingdom should provoke us to build it up, strengthen it, extend it with greater unanimity of purpose. No greater blessing can come to individuals, to families, or to nations than that of obeying the Author of our salvation, following His commandments, and welcoming His Kingdom, with all the freedom and the supernatural riches it promises us.

—His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, in the encyclical *Sertum laetitiae*, issued Nov. 1, 1939.

Book Reviews

IL NAZIONALSOCIALISMO E LA SANTA SEDE. By Michele Maccarrone. Rome: Editrice Studium, 1947. Pp. ix + 271. L. it. 450.

This book deals with the relations between the Holy See and Germany during the domination of National Socialism, a period only twelve years long but very important.

A complete history of this period cannot yet be written because of the difficulty of full documentation. True, German documents have been found and published, particularly on the occasion of the Nürnberg trials: but a lot of them might have perished in the war havoc. Furthermore the archives material of World War II is not yet available to historians.

The attitude of the Holy See toward National Socialism has been the object of discussion and of adverse criticism on the part of men who evidently were not fully acquainted with the real situation. The book of Rev. Michele Maccarrone, Professor of Ecclesiastical History at the Roman Seminary, without pretending to exhaust the subject, will enlighten public opinion on this question of great importance. This book is "a presentation of documents and facts," as the author says in the foreword. These documents represent the essential part of the book. Most of them are known but scattered here and there in the *Osservatore Romano* and other publications. The author had access to a few unpublished documents graciously made available to him in order to aid his work of documentation. The documentation of *Il nazionalsocialismo e la santa sede* is therefore, complete in a relative and limited sense.

The merit of this book is to have gathered, arranged, and presented these documents. Evidently the work was not written with much concern for present conditions, and it does not carry comments. It is presented to the unprejudiced scholar anxious to know at the source the attitude of the Holy See toward National Socialism, an attitude maintained constantly and uninterruptedly the same from early 1933 up to the end of the Third Reich. Since this valiant attitude of the Holy See will be recorded in the history of modern times, Fr. Maccarrone's historical presentation is important.

Il nazionalsocialismo e la santa sede is arranged in six chapters: the Concordat with the Reich, the negotiations for the execution of the Concordat, the opposition against Catholics and clergy, the Encyclical *Mit Brenneder Sorge,* the persecution of 1938-39, and the years of World War II.

It would take too long to review fully the contents of this book and to stress the most important points, but a few items will be mentioned here.

Most interesting are the documents concerning German statements and Vatican requests before the conclusion and ratification of the Concordat (pp.14-27), particularly the letter of Sept. 2, 1933, sent to the Cardinal Secretary of State by Cardinal Bertram in the name of the German Hierarchy gathered in Fulda. The second chapter deals with various missions of Doctor Buttmann (1933-34) which were followed with great interest by Catholics the world over. The question of Catholic Associations, protected by Article 31 of the Concordat (soon openly violated by the Nationalist Government) was under discussion, but, of course, that was not the only question. Fr. Maccarrone states that the contrast between the Holy See and National Socialism is well represented by one of the most important documents, the long memorandum of Jan. 31, 1934, sent by the Cardinal Secretary of State to the German Ambassador.

The documentation of the strenuous conflict that centered around Catholic education is presented in its general lines. Then follow in sad sequel the attacks against the schools, the ordinances against the Catholic press, the obstacles placed in the way of the education of the clergy, the "currency trials," (particularly the famous one against Bishop Legge of Misnia), and the decree on "Political Catholicism." The situation became so serious that the Holy Father had to denounce it in a dignified but solemn way to the whole world with the Encyclical, *Mit Brennender Sorge* of March 14, 1937. The National Socialist Government, in perfect bad faith, attemped to show that the Encyclical was a mere political document. The Holy See retorted with a Note, given to the German Ambassador on April 30, 1937. This document is important for the clear answer given to the German Government and the proofs concerning the serious Nazi persecution (pp. 166 ff.). Then follows the famous episode of Cardinal Mundelein, and the direct answer (well known in the United States) given by the Holy See to the brutal insinuation of the Third Reich (pp. 183-86).

The year 1938 is the turn of the "Anschluss" and the beginning and swift progress of the persecution against the Church in Austria. During the war, there occurred religious persecutions in the countries occupied by Germany and particularly in Poland. Two documents, the value of which will grow in time, are the Notes of the Secretariat of State of Jan. 18, 1942, and of March 2, 1943. The author calls the first (pp. 235-40) "a documentation of the independence of the Holy See from National Socialism then master of almost the whole of Europe." This document reveals the opposition of the Holy See to the German attempt to interfere with the appointment of Bishops in the occupied countries. The second Note (pp. 241-52) concerns Poland and proves abundantly the incredible persecution of the Church in that country.

Unfortunately, all the steps taken by the Holy See were in vain and the German Government surrendered only to force.

Fr. Maccarrone's record of this mighty struggle of the Church is a page of modern history, of great significance and full of warnings.

MSGR. FRANCESCO LARDONE

THE MESSIAS. By the Rev. Josef Pickl. Translated by the Rev. Andrew Green, O.S.B. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1946. Pp. ix + 333. $4.00.

It is seldom indeed that a book appears which deserves the description, "unusual," as thoroughly as this volume does. It is easy to find much in it to praise, even easier to find much to criticize, and almost impossible to do it objective justice in a review that does not run to many pages.

The author, who was a chaplain with German troops in the Balkans in the first World War, gathers together an extensive array of ancient profane references which throw light on Roman military *mores* of the time of Christ and on the vivid details of the Jewish struggle for secular independence through the last century before Jerusalem was erased by Titus. Interpreting the Gospel texts, especially those of the Passion, in the light of these sources, Fr. Pickl arrives at an explanation of the reaction of our Lord's contemporaries to His Messianic claims, and of countless familiar details of His last days, which is—to say the least—highly original and provocative.

From 6 A.D. to the destruction of Jerusalem, the author tells us, Palestine was in a ferment from bands of *lestes,* guerrilla bands whose aim was the forcible expulsion of the Romans. These efforts were strongly opposed by the Pharisees, though they were increasingly popular with the Jewish people, particularly in Galilee where the movement was born. These *lestes* were the "robbers" about whom our English translation speaks. Such were Barabbas and the "thieves" who were crucified with Christ. The distorted Messianic expectations of the Jews looked for the leader of some such group of *lestes* to be revealed, through his victories over the Romans, as the Messias whom they awaited. By the people at large, by the Pharisees, and finally by Pilate and the Roman soldiers, our Lord was looked upon as such a *lestes*—and all the subtle and savage details of the Passion, from Judas' betrayal to the fierce mockery on Calvary, are to be explained by this general identification of Christ with what the Vulgate (along with Zorell and Liddell & Scott) would mistranslate as "a robber."

This is the basic theme of *The Messias.* To its substantiation, and to the consequent meaning of many details of Christ's life and death, the

author brings an abundance of informative quotations from Josephus, Caesar, and other ancient writers, and from Holy Scripture itself, as well as frequent anecdotes from his Balkan experience which are offered as illustrations of Oriental mannerisms and superstitions.

In its English form, however, the book is disorderly—and one suspects that its rearrangement reflects an even more dismaying confusion in the German. It is repetitious in the extreme, and marred by the equation of assured facts with other details which are often little more than intelligent conjecture. The author's use of "undoubtedly," and the like, is much too generous to his central theme.

Yet, even in these important shortcomings, the book is unusually virile. It paints the violence of that first Christian century, particularly in our Lord's native land, with unforgettable strokes. The reader may remain at the end (as this reviewer does) highly skeptical of the author's central interpretations, but he will be enriched in a heightened ability to look upon Christ through the eyes of His contemporaries. *The Messias* is a portrait whose great value lies in the excellence of the background and the frame, rather than in the sureness with which the central figure is drawn.

JOSEPH BLUETT, S.J.

THE THREE AGES OF THE INTERIOR LIFE. Vol. I. By Reginald Garrigou Lagrange, O.P. Trans. by Sister M. Timothea Doyle, O.P. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1947. Pp. xvi + 494. $5.00.

This excellent translation of volume I of Father Garrigou-Lagrange's synthesis of the spiritual life, *Les trois âges le la vie intérieure,* is a monumental contribution to the English-speaking world of the great Dominican theologian's thought on the meaning and relationship of ascetic and mystical development of the interior life—a summary of the courses which he has been giving in this field for twenty years at the Angelicum in Rome. After a general consideration of all the foundations of the life of grace, the volume discusses with great detail and documentation the "three ages," or steps in spiritual progress. These are the "elimination of obstacles, the progress of the soul purified and illumined by the light of the Holy Ghost, the docility which it ought to have toward Him, and finally the union with God which the soul attains by this docility, by the spirit of prayer, and by the cross borne with patience, gratitude, and love." In brief, we have here a dissertation on the familiar purgative, illuminative, and unitive stages in spiritual perfection.

Perhaps the central thesis and outstanding contribution of this work is its insistence that ascetical theology and life, as represented in the first two steps or "ages," is not essentially different from but rather is

ordained to the mystical. With St. Thomas Aquinas, St. John of the Cross, and St. Francis de Sales, and as against Scaramelli and other authors of the eighteenth century, Garrigou-Lagrange maintains that "the mystical life is not essentially extraordinary, like visions and revelations, but something eminent in the normal way of sanctity." By sanctity, he understands close union with God, through love of God and neighbor, "a perfection which nevertheless always remains in the normal way, for the precept of love has no limits." Further than this, he argues that the infused contemplation of the mysteries of faith is generally necessary for sanctity in its perfection of the third "age," but, within the order of divine grace, he views this as a normal mode for the gifts of the Holy Ghost and not as something essentially extraordinary.

Relative to the experiences of ecstasy and other phenomena of rapture associated with saints like St. Teresa and frequently referred to as "mystical," the author holds with the Carmelite theologian Joseph of the Holy Ghost that "If infused contemplation is taken in the sense of rapture, ecstasy, or similar favors, we cannot apply ourselves to it, or ask it of God, or desire it: but as for infused contemplation in itself, as an act of contemplation (abstraction being made of ecstasy which may accidentally accompany it), we can aspire to it, desire it ardently, and humbly ask it of God, although we cannot certainly endeavor to have it by our own industry or our own activity." With this understanding, he removes infused contemplation of God from the category of prophecy and the gift of tongues, establishes it in the order of sanctifying grace, and urges that all, and especially souls consecrated to God, should strive to the actual enjoyment of union with God.

In further development of these principles, "the three stages of the spiritual life" are charted, and practical guidance is given through several chapters, ranging from spiritual reading, through self-discipline, prayer, assistance at Mass, and reception of the sacraments. In this section, the author pursues the same lofty course as in his basic analysis of the interior life, but along the lines of exhortation which somehow have the flavor of sermons to religious.

In the humble judgment of this reviewer, the chapters on active purification of the imagination and the intellect, following a familiar trend of thought, are so other-worldly as to confuse and discourage any kind of imaginative and intellectual curiosity except that which is explicitly oriented towards the essence and attributes of Almighty God. Perhaps a greater service would have been rendered, if, for example, instead of baldly quoting the author of *The Imitation of Christ* on "the contempt of everything created in order to find the Creator," or "on vain and worldly learning," the author had given some definite indications, in

the spirit of St. Francis, on the validity and importance of study in all fields of creation and activity as leading to a fuller understanding of God and of His law.

There is obvious also a certain amount of repetition which bulks up the book needlessly for the student and searcher of practical guidance. A foreword by Cardinal Stritch adds distinction to the volume, and a bibliography and index contribute to make this work an important theological instrument which should be in the library of every student of the spiritual life and counsellor of souls.

JAMES A. MAGNER

GOD'S OWN METHOD. By Aloysius McDonough, C.P., S.T.D. Union City, N. J.: *The Sign* Press, 1947. Pp. 160. $2.00.

This book contains twelve chapters, which originally appeared as separate articles in *The Sign*. The basic idea is that the most fruitful and most successful method of teaching the lessons that will bring us to life eternal is that which God Himself employed to propound truth to the world—the life, Passion and death of His Son Incarnate. Accordingly, in *God's Own Method* Fr. McDonough presents various considerations drawn from the doctrines of the Incarnation and the Redemption in order that he may inspire in the reader what he calls a "workaday approach" to Our Blessed Saviour.

The most noteworthy and most commendable feature of this book is the consistent and frequent use of theological teachings, found on every page, yet presented so clearly and so simply that any Catholic should be able to grasp their significance. Every devotional point is supported by sound theology. Quite correctly does the book-jacket describe this contribution to ascetical literature as "Theology of the mind and heart in the parlance of the day." In view of the superficial attention to theology, or even the total disregard of this sacred science, manifested in some spiritual writings, *God's Own Method* is a convincing example of the profound inspirational force inherent in the theological doctrines that are pertinent to the mystery of our redemption.

Not only the fundamental principles of Christology and Soteriology appear in this work, but many more detailed points discussed in theological manuals are also incorporated with appropriate applications. Thus, the author treats the instrumental casualty of Christ's humanity (p. 47), the compatibility of sorrow in the soul of Christ with the Beatific Vision (p. 48), the psychological origin of the bloody sweat (p. 97) and the exact cause of our Lord's death (p. 101). Certain other theological questions, though not directly pertinent to the Incarnation, are also touched on, such as the possibility of a morally indifferent